

Outdoor Education for Sustainable Living?: An investigation into the potential of Scottish local authority residential outdoor education centres to deliver programmes relating to sustainable living.

Robbie Nicol

Doctor of Philosophy
University of Edinburgh
2001



ABSTRACT

Human beings are dependent on natural, physical and biological processes for their survival and health and it is argued that the 'well-being' of nature is inseparable from the physical and psychological 'well-being' of the human condition. However, there is evidence to suggest that the Earth's resources cannot provide indefinitely for the requirements of the human race given their present rates of consumption.

Deep ecology is used as a standpoint to understand the relationship between the human and non-human world and is the basis from which different ways of knowing is explored. Outdoor education provides opportunities for one way of exploring these relationships. Theoretical perspectives associated with these concepts are explored together with empirical data to ask, 'what can outdoor education do for sustainable living?'

Results are presented of a qualitative study of five local authority residential outdoor education centres. The research approach involved observations of, and interviews with, instructors followed by interviews with centre principals, visiting school teachers and senior officers within education (or community education) departments.

Findings show a greater amount of time is spent on outdoor activities and the personal and social development aspects of outdoor education with very little time spent on environmental education. The reasons for this are historical precedent (this is the way it has always been done), a desire to be associated with the 5-14 curricular guidelines (to be seen as educationally respectable) and instructor preference. I identify three aspects of personal and social development (interpersonal relationships, self-esteem and self-awareness) as outcomes that instructors claim to be working towards. However, there is some doubt as to their validity given the absence of internal evaluation or external empirical support. The outcomes are nevertheless verified by different sources of data. I suggest that this incongruity is metaphysical in origin where the inductive claims of practitioners, whilst being appreciated by a range of sources, do not find external validity when exposed to external analysis.

Environmental aspects within outdoor education courses are identified as marginal and unfocussed with the study revealing only one example which tends towards ecocentrism. Correspondingly, the majority of outdoor education practices are more readily associated with anthropocentrism. Any move from anthropocentric to ecocentric education will involve significant political, strategic, pedagogical, organisational and perceptual change. A role is identified for the Scottish Executive to provide political recognition that outdoor education can act as a provider of sustainability education. Strategic direction would need to be influenced by the concept of sustainability in line with international documentation such as *Agenda 21*. Pedagogy would need to move beyond the current conception of the environment as 'the green environment' to include social, political and economic dimensions. To deliver such programmes, centres would have to consider new goals and structures which would require staff training at all levels of the organisation. This would need to be accompanied by a shift in perception on the part of instructors, principals, visiting teachers and local authority officers for successful implementation.

CONTENTS

	Page no.
Abstract	i
Contents	ii
Tables	iii
Acknowledgements	iv
Chapter 1: Outdoor Education	1
Chapter 2: Education and Learning	11
Chapter 3: Outdoor Education - Research Topic or Universal Value?	26
Chapter 4: The Research Approach	56
Chapter 5: The Pilot Study	64
Chapter 6: Interpersonal Relationships	99
Chapter 7: Self-esteem	119
Chapter 8: Self-Awareness	136
Chapter 9: Environmental Education	156
Chapter 10: Outdoor Education and Sustainable Living	174
Chapter 11: Education Officers	215
Chapter 12: Summary and Conclusions	224
References	233
Appendix 1: Propositions	247
Appendix 2: Interview and Observation Schedule - Instructors	249
Appendix 3: Interview Schedule - Principals	253
Appendix 4: Interview Schedule - LEA Officers	257

TABLES

	Page no.
Table 1: Instructor Training and Length of Service	65
Table 2: Programme Model	74
Table 3: A Conceptual Framework	151
Table 4: Programme Relating Outdoor Education and Sustainable Development	185

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

To the 'old hands' who told me that this would be a lonely process I would like to say 'you were right'. What they didn't tell me, but I should have known, is that it is lonely for others too. As I found out, it is quite possible to share a house with someone without sharing the same world.

Amongst those to whom I look forward to renewing my acquaintance with I would like to mention my wife Jane. Despite her own hectic work schedule the support she provided helped me to keep going when my spirit flagged. During this time I have been a poor brother and uncle and I look forward to spending more time with my family.

In coping with these difficulties I must acknowledge the Caledonian pine forest at the back of my house where I ran on a daily basis. It was in these woods where many of my thoughts crystallised as the combination of endorphin release and the sight, sound and smell of the forest infused me with its own inspirational reality.

In coping with other difficulties I must acknowledge the expertise and support of my supervisory team of Dr Pat McLaughlin and Dr Peter Higgins. I knew precisely what I expected of my supervisors before I started the thesis. These expectations were not only fulfilled but exceeded. The most tangible expression of this support was the reading and rereading of drafts and the enthusiasm for our regular meetings. However, the true value of my supervision was the intellectual freedom I was encouraged to enjoy. I was given a long rein to explore the world of ideas and then gently reined in to be reminded of the empirical world. For this sensitive and careful management I thank you both.

Working from home, some two hundred kilometres from Edinburgh, presented me with certain logistical problems. I would like to thank the library staff at the Faculty of Education's Cramond Campus for their forbearance in dealing with my 'long distance' requests. For the nights I had to stay away from home I would like to thank Sadie and Jimmy Centre, Mary and Pete Higgins, Janice and Mike Redpath, John Taylor and Dick Edie for inviting me into their own homes.

From my own experiences and observations of pupils, I believe local authority outdoor education centres to be special places. I would like to thank the instructors, principals and senior officers who allowed me access to their working lives to wrestle with what it is they are achieving.

OUTDOOR EDUCATION

The Journey

Overlooking Loch Avon from Coire Raibeirt near the summit of Cairn Gorm in the Grampian mountain range a group of outdoor education teachers sat enjoying each others company on a warm, sunny, late summers day. Beinn Mheadhoin filled the middle distance with its large rocky stacks dwarfing the antlike hikers walking past them. The deep glacial trench of Loch Avon stretched north westwards where it narrowed to form the headwaters of the River Avon and its embryonic meander towards the confluence with the River Spey. To the south, the rocky crags above the Shelter Stone provided an impressive foreground to Loch Etchachan. The vegetation around us seemed mature although not yet changing to autumnal colours, whilst two ptarmigan displayed their own sensitivity to the changing seasons being now a mixture of summer and winter plumage. Amongst this sublime setting one of the teachers said, 'if you ever want to explain to people what outdoor education is all about then all you have to do is take them up here and they will see for themselves'. A sense of agreement pervaded those gathered.

If someone asked any of the group at that time to describe the essence of those shared moments they would probably have struggled to give voice to their experiences. It seemed to be more of an intuitive understanding that *this* is what it is all about, a feeling of oneness with self, others and the environment. Nobody disagreed with the statement probably because no-one wanted to. If any disagreement had been felt then there were sufficient critical thinkers to suggest that, 'no, this is not what outdoor education is all about'. What remained then was a consensus that something special happened that day indicating that places such as those in the Cairngorms can create moments of clarity that have a worthwhile place in the educational process. It served as a form of legitimacy, reinforcing those shared values which professionals in any field must be reminded of now and again in recognition of their work being worthwhile.

However, something seems amiss here. A critical observer could ask, does outdoor education depend simply on 'intuition' and 'moments of clarity'? If the response is in the affirmative, is there no case for a reasoned or rational understanding? The same observer could also ask if a group of inner city pupils would understand this form of education, sitting in the same place in the same conditions but without any input from their teacher. The observer might finally become extremely skeptical about the value of outdoor education if they imagined the inner city group sitting in the same place with the wind howling, rain hammering down and mist reducing visibility to the end of their

toecaps. Recognising that the pupils may well be miserable the observer might well conclude that no positive process could possibly accrue from an uninterpreted aesthetic experience of the high mountains, particularly in adverse conditions.

Therefore, what does constitute outdoor education? Such thoughts raise fundamental questions as to the aims, content, methods, measurement and distribution of outdoor education. The preceding passage provides a series of prompts to begin looking for the assumptions (explicit and implicit) underpinning outdoor education as understood within the United Kingdom. It poses questions such as, to what extent does philosophy serve as a legitimating basis of knowledge? Is there any connection between philosophy and methodology and, if so, is it conscious or assumed? What is the relationship between methodology and practice? Are learning outcomes best achieved through sensory approaches or cognitive? Only when these questions have been addressed will it be possible to critically examine the above passage to determine whether or not it constitutes outdoor education. In short the debate surrounding philosophy, methodology and the relative merits of adopting a rational (cognitive) or aesthetic (sensory) teaching approach is far from resolved, nor are there signs that answers are forthcoming.

In addition to contributing to this debate this thesis represents a personal quest, or, in outdoor education parlance, a journey. The motivation to embark on this journey has its roots in many such formative experiences as the Loch Avon day but for some inexplicable reason this incident resulted in my curiosity reaching a critical point. I suspect this had much to do with the differences between my own academic understanding of outdoor education, nurtured over a five year period of tertiary education, and a three year period working as an outdoor education instructor in a variety of public, private and charitable sector settings. I perceived a difference between theory and practice and practice and theory and theory and practice... The shared experience on Cairn Gorm therefore is not the beginning of the journey but a staging point. Like any journey there is a destination. In literal terms I know where I want the thesis to go and have devised a series of research questions and research methods to get there. In metaphorical terms I recognise that in crossing a mountain range factors beyond my control will influence my decisions along the way. The weather may close in, a group member may twist an ankle or I might make a navigation error. Before embarking I was prepared for these possibilities. I was prepared to weather the storm, strap up ankles and use whatever navigational techniques necessary to relocate when getting lost. In short therefore I was willing to detour and even visit unintended areas. In the course of the thesis all of this happened. What was never in doubt, nor open for debate, was the destination. The most difficult question was choosing from a range of options involving *how* to get there without too much deviation.

Outdoor Education and its Philosophical Literature

The destination was influenced by the fact that at this point (1997) an extensive search revealed only nineteen published texts (those that included ISBNs) in the United Kingdom relating to outdoor education (Loader, 1952; Hogan, 1968; Parker, 1970; Fletcher, 1971; Drasdo, 1973; Parker and Meldrum, 1973; Department of Education and Science, 1983; Mortlock, 1984; Hunt, 1989; Hopkins and Putnam, 1993; Greenaway, 1990; Ogilvie, 1993; Dearling and Armstrong, 1994; Barrett and Greenaway, 1995; Greenaway, 1996; Barnes, 1997; Gair, 1997; Higgins, *et al.*, 1997 and McDonald, 1997. Of these, sixteen may be categorised as descriptive where the authors intentions were either historical, embryonic, or the production of a facilitators handbook or resource guide. The remaining three represent the only examples in the United Kingdom whereby the author's intentions were philosophical with Drasdo (1973) writing about aesthetics, Mortlock (1984) values, and Hopkins and Putnam (1993) personal growth. Some might want to challenge the completeness of this listing. For example, the major youth organisations such as the Scouts and Duke of Edinburgh would point to their own publications; so too would organisations such as the Brathay Trust and Outward Bound. Similarly a number of texts have been published during and since 1997 (the point at which this research began). However, whilst the number of descriptive texts could be added to, those relating to the latter could not. The fact remains that very little has been written from within outdoor education about outdoor education specifically for outdoor educators that has philosophical, methodological, empirical grounding and visionary content. This is a point made by Nicol and Higgins (1998) who point out the way outdoor educationalists have looked to bodies of literature relating to mountaineering, travel and adventure for vision and inspiration. Whilst this body of literature may be visionary and inspirational it is not methodological providing the outdoor educator with little pedagogical interpretation nor insights.

Outdoor Education and its Empirical Research

When juxtaposed with these philosophical shortcomings the existence of empirical research work appears to fare no better. Cheesmond (1981: 24) noted 'a paucity of research work generally in this field'. More recently Barrett and Greenaway (1995: 53) were commissioned to review empirical work within the United Kingdom and found research to be:

'isolated,
inconclusive,
over-ambitious,
uncritical,
difficult to locate'.

This is supported by the frank admission from Hopkins and Putnam (1993) that the effectiveness of outdoor education is unclear. Attempts have been made to address

these shortcomings with the publication of several meta-analyses to establish the link between programme characteristics and specific outcomes (Cason and Gillis, 1994; Hattie *et al.*, 1997; Neill and Richards, 1998). One assumption built into outcome based research is that by increasingly refining the research tool the researcher will become better at identifying outcomes and making predictions. These meta-analyses may be seen in this light where researchers are using research to demonstrate the effectiveness of *what is already done*.

The treatment of outcome based issues has been at the expense of a broader research agenda. One of the consequences of this is the failure to locate empirical work within bodies of theory. In other words social theory is not used for the interpretation of empirical data. Outdoor education research does not adopt a critical stance and seek to uncover underlying assumptions. This means that it does not deal with the social construction of knowledge. In other words the outcomes are deemed to have an empirical reality independent of the social sphere to which they are supposed to relate. For May (1997: 27) social theory is essential because it enables a more general orientation 'in relation to political (and) social issues, as well as providing a basis for critical reflection on the process of the research itself and social life and social systems in general'.

Within this uncritical culture the practice of outdoor education emerges without any rational development. Consequently, when researching the area of outdoor education, the platform of precedents from which a thesis might normally proceed does not exist in any coherent form. There is no social theory of outdoor education. It is for situations such as these that Miles and Huberman (1994: 90) claim that 'qualitative studies are often mounted to *explore* a new area and to build or "emerge" a theory about it'.

Sustainable Living

However, outdoor education is not the subject of this thesis; to continue the metaphor, it is not the destination. Indeed outdoor education is only an instrumental means of engaging with the primary destination. This can be summarised in the primary research question 'what can outdoor education do for sustainable living?' What I am doing is using outdoor education as one way of exploring sustainable living. In this way outdoor education is the means whilst sustainable living, being the destination, is the end.

Sustainable development, sustainability and sustainable living have all become popular terms in the last two decades. The terms have been the source of a formidable raft of international and national policy documents. There is agreement that the terms refer to

three core aspects, namely, the environment, society and economics. The combined message of the policy documents is that the world's population is living unsustainably and that each sector of society, including every living person, has a role to play in reversing this trend.

The Role of Education

Within this context educationalists have sought to identify the role of education in how human beings might live within the limits of the Earth. However, there is a growing body of literature to suggest that far from providing answers to issues of sustainability, education has some responsibility for causing and then maintaining, unsustainable living in the first place (Evernden, 1985; Bowers, 1993; Orr, 1993 and 1994; Abram, 1996; O'Sullivan, 1999). For example, there is the view that education in the modern world was designed to exploit natural resources to fuel the industrial revolution, create economic growth and ultimately lubricate global expansion. When used in this sense the purpose of education is to promote capitalism through the exploitation and domination of natural resources. This line of reasoning suggests that education today, like its forebearers, proceeds as if there was no planetary emergency.

To move from this form of education to one that embraces sustainability requires rethinking the purpose of education. One of the first challenges is Cartesian rationality. The reasoning to support this is that this inherited epistemological position (of the Western world) exists as a deeply embedded cultural construct which acts as an invisible mediator of knowledge. The Cartesian dualism separates the knower from the known, the thinking subject from the non-thinking object, people from place, and ultimately, the human from the non-human. It is this separation which is partly responsible for the cultural orientation that human beings are isolated from, and independent of the natural world. It is its invisibility which allows people to live in ignorance, or denial, of the belief that there is a planetary emergency. The educational challenge is to make the invisible visible in order to provide the understanding necessary to reconnect the separation. In this manner human beings may better recognise their utter dependence on the natural world for their own survival and take action towards sustainable living.

In order to achieve this, the existing assumption of a single, wholly determinable, objective reality needs to be taken to task. Very often the knowledge which comes to us is a second order expression of reality, something found by someone else and presented as a source of truth for general consumption. In this way knowledge acts as a barrier between the individual subject and the source of reality. It is argued that new ways need to be found to legitimate subjectivity and the nature of experience. For example, there is a call for an epistemology which recognises the individual's inner

experience in relation to their perception of external stimulus. This is not to deny objectivity so much as to redefine it 'as a striving to achieve greater consensus, greater agreement or consonance among a plurality of subjects' (Abram, 1997: 38). This opens the door to ways of knowing where peoples' ordinary and everyday life can be associated with issues of sustainability. It is achieved through an epistemological pluralism which embraces different ways of knowing. In this manner people can come to know the world not only through the type of cognition apparent in scientific rationality but through feelings of respect, curiosity, wonder and awe for the planet which sustains them. The philosophical challenge for educators is to provide a framework of understanding where the world of ideas is rooted in the same world in which people carry out their multi-sensory everyday lives.

In response to these issues Smyth (1995: 18) has commented 'it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that many have reached, that education should be largely recast'. For the moment, however, the potential of education to address issues of sustainability is not known. Ideas relating to sustainability are not a set of coherent propositions which can be easily added on to existing practices. In recasting education one of the challenges would appear to be overcoming the tendency to educate indoors. This is in keeping with the view that an emphasis on indoor learning can lead to the suppression of the feelings from which respect, curiosity, wonder and awe for the world beyond the classroom grows.

Allied to this is the assumption that the divisions which compartmentalise subject based curricula lead to divisions in the way pupils understand the world, which, it is argued, reinforces Cartesian rationality. There is a tendency, perhaps for institutional convenience rather than philosophical dogma, to separate and compartmentalise strands of knowledge which are related. Brennan (1994: 3) calls this 'framework thinking' and its limits are identified as preventing learners from seeing beyond the subject they are studying (e.g. physics or biology), nor do they see that the framework itself exists. There is a concern that this reductionist way of presenting knowledge operates at the expense of an integrated understanding of the world. As Sterling (1996: 36) observes 'the relation between areas (is) more important than decontextualised studies'. In short there is a call for a holistic understanding which deals with interconnectedness and interdisciplinarity drawing on both the social and natural sciences, to take place indoors and out. The purpose is to engender understandings which sees the environment not simply as an ecosystem independent of human beings but a social ecosystem in which human beings are clearly located. In this manner the area of study becomes one indivisible and interactive system focussing on the political and socio-economic influences that affect ecological processes. The need for this, as Sterling (1996: 20-21) observes, is because 'all education takes place within a dominant

cultural, social and political context, any discussion of EFS (education for sustainability) - which by implication seeks to influence society - must first recognise the greater influence of the dominant social paradigm upon education'. Because of these tensions education is seen as both part of the problem and part of the solution. As Sterling (1996: 18) observes 'if it is to fulfil its potential as an *agent of change* towards a more sustainable society, sufficient attention must be given to education as the *subject of change* itself'.

What I have presented so far is the view of the globalist. These are the people whose vision provides an overview of the current situation and ways of looking to the future. As globalists, their views are necessarily generalist tending in some cases towards overstatement. However, this is the way of theory. I do not present these theoretical insights as if they were monolithic nor written in tablets of stone. Instead I use them as an assemblage of ideas from which to make explicit the assumptions upon which the research will be based. Given the lack of theoretical underpinning of outdoor education allied to the embryonic development of ideas relating to sustainable living there is a constant interaction between theory and research throughout the thesis.

In defining my research problem it becomes apparent why constant mediation between theory and the empirical world is important. In selecting Scottish (with one English exception) local authority residential outdoor education centres I have chosen an aspect of *informal* education. One of outdoor education's defining characteristics is that it is not legally incorporated into the formal curriculum. As such it is not necessarily bound by the same conventions of subject centredness which concern the globalists. In addition, outdoor education sells itself as an integrated cross-curricular approach to education. Furthermore, outdoor education centres tend to use the Scottish Office Education Department 5-14 national curriculum guidelines (1993) in relation to their work. This series of documents provides opportunities, particularly in the primary years, to integrate subject disciplines in a way that the defined subject centredness and teacher specific nature of secondary schools and some institutions of higher education do not. Consequently, simply by selecting certain cases to research, I have highlighted exceptions to the theoretical perspectives above, namely that opportunities for subject integration and holistic education currently exist. Outdoor education, *potentially*, represents an alternative pedagogic endeavour to the body of theory I have presented. As an 'exception' to the rule it represents a distinct opportunity to develop education in relation to sustainability which could well lead to further theoretical development.

In theory the connection between outdoor education and sustainability is quite straightforward. Sustainability is an objective of environmental education (Smyth, 1999) and environmental education is an objective of outdoor education (Higgins and

Loynes, 1997). The primary aim of this thesis is to test this link in practice.

The lack of philosophical treatment and empirical inquiry noted above has even more significance when considering the local authority provision of residential outdoor education. Say for example a centre takes on average 50 pupils per 5-day-week, this amounts to 250 pupil-days per centre per week. Taken over a school year of approximately 200 days (40 weeks) this would amount to 50,000 pupil days per centre per year. Since there are ten such centres in Scotland this means that there are approximately 500,000 pupil days every year in Scotland.

Also, it is normal for school teachers to accompany pupils. If two teachers were to accompany every class then this would amount to 10 teacher days per week (this figure is likely to be much higher since it is not uncommon for five teachers to accompany the pupils). Following the same procedures as for pupil days this would amount to 400 per year per centre, and 4000 teacher days per year for the whole of Scotland.

Furthermore, research shows that there are 66 instructor staff (full and part-time) employed at these centres (Nicol, 1998). When the calculations including pupil days and teacher days is juxtaposed with the number of instructor employees it becomes clear that the operation of local authority residential outdoor education centres constitutes a significant enterprise. The scale of local authority provision of residential outdoor education adds further to the need for research to be conducted in this area.

Introducing the Thesis

Chapter Two begins with a personal orientation describing the relationship between the research and the researcher. The theoretical framework of deep ecology is introduced as the moderating template on which analysis is to be based. The chapter also notes an epistemological absence in deep ecology and sets about establishing one.

In Chapter Three the historical development of outdoor education since the Second World War is described. It provides definitions of outdoor education and a range of ideological and policy positions that have been deployed in its defence. Analysis of secondary sources begins to show how outdoor education practitioners intended their subject to be an integration of outdoor activities, personal and social development and environmental education. Further explorations draw on 'forgotten' sources which I use to explore the experimental excitement in which outdoor education evolved in schools and residential centres. These early beginnings are reviewed in the light of developing and contemporary, individual, organisational, social and economic factors which came to influence the philosophy and direction of outdoor education.

Throughout this chapter I identify some obvious gaps in the literature. To assist this process I wrote to three people whom I knew to be long serving, now retired, academic practitioners of outdoor education (Neville Crowther, Roger Mansfield and John Cheesmond). I knew their knowledge of outdoor education to be in excess of their published contributions. I wrote to them outlining specific areas and used their expertise to fill in some of the gaps. Their contributions have added to my understanding of the field and have been referenced in the text. This material is a new contribution to the public domain.

Chapter Four outlines the research sites. Five local authority residential outdoor education centres were selected (four in Scotland and one in England). Observations of the instructors working with groups were carried out. These were followed up by interviews with the instructors. The second stage involved interviews with principals and the third, interviews with visiting teachers. Up to this point the research data related to outdoor education in general. Throughout stage four another series of interviews with principals deals more specifically with environmental education and sustainability. The final stage involved interviews with senior officers within local authorities who had responsibility for outdoor education.

Given the diverse range of aims, and the relative importance that instructors attach to them, a framework is presented in Chapter Five to distinguish between aspects of their work that instructors feel are important. As a pilot study this presents an empirical picture of outdoor education from the instructors' and principal's perspective. The variables I used to develop a coding system included, length of service, pre-service and in-service training, individual preference, organisational ethos and the relationship between aims, activities and evaluation. Within this framework certain tensions were uncovered which questioned the theoretical position that outdoor education was a balance of aims. Instead the empirical reality pointed to an imbalance favouring outdoor activities and personal and social development.

Chapters Six, Seven and Eight explore this imbalance in relation to the 5-14 guidelines on personal and social development (SOED, 1993c). In particular, data from the interviews and observations were reformulated as propositions which correspond with these guidelines. Consequently, Chapter Six examines interpersonal relationships, Chapter Seven, self-esteem and Chapter Eight, self-awareness. Throughout these chapters I explore the relationship between personal and social development and environmental education. Given the lack of existing analytic tools to do this successfully I developed a conceptual framework for analysis. This framework was headed 'aims', 'assumptions', 'content', 'methods' and 'claims'. The framework provided me with a standard mechanism with which to mediate between empirical data,

propositions and emerging theory. It is a framework which I began formulating in Chapter Six and continued to use through to Chapter Nine. The framework also provided a frame of reference in which the data relating to visiting school teachers could be viewed alongside that of instructors and principals.

Chapter Nine looks at environmental education as a neglected form of inquiry and practice. It identifies one form (Earthkeepers) that is specifically focussed on providing an integrated approach to environmental education. Since this form of education is not the norm, the chapter explores the organisational factors in which this particular programme is delivered. In particular organisational ethos was looked at to understand why one centre was more likely to deliver environmental education than another. Chapter Ten continues to build on this concept but goes a step further. To understand why environmental education is such a limited aspiration, a programme complete with 'principles of sustainable development', 'ethical principles', 'principles of learning' and a 'timetable of activities' complete with 'learning outcomes' was presented to principals for discussion. The programme was based on the ontological vision of deep ecology and an emergent epistemological position which embraces multiple ways of knowing. In writing up this programme I sought to demonstrate that, at a philosophical level, outdoor education *could* deliver outcomes specific to sustainable living. Through discussion with the principals I was seeking to establish any specific or special role that outdoor education might have, as well as any barriers to implementation.

Building on the potential for programme diversification Chapter Eleven draws on interviews with senior education officers to present their view of the role of residential outdoor education. This serves to establish the current policy context in which outdoor education is located and in particular the extent to which local authorities envision a role for outdoor education in relation to sustainable living.

In the light of this assessment, Chapter Twelve provides a summary of findings, conclusions and areas for further study. It argues that if such a strategy is to take place researchers and practitioners must rediscover the forgotten origins of outdoor education as a radical educational experiment. This would need to have strategic support at Scottish Executive level, through to the pre-service and in-service training of instructors at educational institutions. It would also include an integrative approach embracing the tripartite commitment of centres, schools and the policy objectives of local authorities.

EDUCATION, LEARNING AND PHILOSOPHY

A thing is right when it tends to preserve the integrity, stability and beauty of the biotic community.

Aldo Leopold (1989: 224-225)

As I write this thesis I am aware of the personal perspective from which I will present what is to come. This is not a subjective weakness (Hart, *et al.*, 1999) but more of a recognition of the way in which I understand the world, what can be known of that world and how it can become known (Bloom, 1956). Accordingly, Creswell (1994: 144) recognises that the reader should 'gain an understanding of the experiences of the researcher that shapes his or her values and biases brought to the research'. In adopting this research approach I acknowledge that there are implications for the collection of data and their analysis. Consequently, it is the task of the researcher to be selective in deciding what counts as data (Scott and Usher, 1996).

Lovelock (1995) addresses this selectivity by distinguishing between the advocate and the scientist. Although an individual may come to represent both positions (Tomashaw, 1989), Lovelock (1995: xvi) suggests that whilst advocacy 'may be good for the democratic process, it is bad for science. Truth is said to be the first casualty of war. It is also weakened by being used selectively in evidence to prove a case...'. The use of evidence to support 'truth' is further complicated because 'truth' is not a single entity but multi-faceted (Maykut and Morehouse, 1994).

The Scientist

Whilst I may declare an interest in the environment, I recognise Lovelock's concerns. I am therefore the embodiment of someone who cares deeply about the environment but I accept the responsibility of presenting evidence which may support or conflict with my own views. Such analysis is in keeping with my belief in pluralism and counters the one-sidedness that Lovelock (1995) warns against. The implications for me as a researcher are that truth(s) may be found by seeking 'to understand the ways in which people negotiate the social contexts in which they find themselves' (Cohen and Manion, 1994: 32).

The Advocate

It was appreciation of, and concern for the environment that led me to become an outdoor educator in the middle years of my life. I was influenced significantly by several academic educators who were responsible for acting as role models during the countryside studies component of my undergraduate degree in recreation management.

Their own appreciation of the environment, empathy with people and commitment to the principles of liberal education led me to believe that most practitioners would share a similar expansive view of outdoor education. Having qualified in outdoor education (receiving a postgraduate diploma where the same liberal principles were endorsed) and having worked in the field for 5 years, I have come to recognise that the situation is much more complex. Amidst this complexity, one point seemed clear: the primary reason for people working in outdoor education was not for, if I can use the term loosely for the moment, environmental reasons. Disillusioned, I decided to investigate the difference between my own perceptions of what is happening and what actually happens. In this manner the advocate's perceptions dictated the area of enquiry whilst the scientist conducted the research.

Philosophy

My perceptions of the world have been influenced by my readings of environmental philosophy. Consequently, when I decide what is important to understanding outdoor education it is done within this framework. This is not to deny the validity of any other framework, but to indicate that the collection and analysis of data should be guided by a particular philosophical perspective (Hirst, 1968). This perspective serves as one aspect of validity, a philosophical template, distinguishing between what counts as data and in what light that data will be viewed.

Philosophy has been described as 'the attempt to make clear, and if possible to answer, a range of fundamental and puzzling questions which arise when...we try to understand ourselves and the universe we inhabit' (Grayling, 1988: 13). It is said to consist of 'a range of central and linked questions, especially questions about the general nature of knowledge, language and concepts, which recur...in all special fields of investigation and reflection' (Jary and Jary, 1991: 468). Traditionally, much of this debate has focussed on the nature of reality (ontology), how that reality can be understood and legitimated (epistemology), and questions about how we should live (ethics). On this basis various philosophers have developed or aligned themselves with particular schools of thought where each school provides their own constitutive version of reality (Russell, 1979).

Ontology deals with first principles, which means inquiry into the nature of existence (Bahm, 1974). These first principles are the basis from which knowledge is developed and has particular relevance to educators as ontological assumptions provide the practice of teaching with an acknowledged foundation. Maykut and Morehouse (1994: 3) suggest that ontological assumptions concern questions such as 'what is the nature of reality?' Reality (or realities, Harvey, 1990), is presented in the manner of ontological assumptions which are expressed as a theory, or theories, about the world.

One theoretical position relevant to this thesis, which developed from the first principles of ontological assumptions, is that of deep ecology. Deep ecology emanates from what its founder, Arne Naess (1988: 29), calls an 'ecological ontology'. Deep ecology is, at the same time, a school of thought, a social movement, an environmental ethic and a reaction to the world's global environmental problems. It posits solutions which require changes in the way humanity thinks about itself and its relationship with the natural environment. In order to achieve such change, a fundamental shift of values has to occur moving from the present relationship where humanity is seen to be the dominator of nature to a position where human beings are located within nature as a biological dependent (Harding, 1997). Naess (1989) has developed a theory of life which he has formulated into an eight point platform of principles.

The theory and platform of principles can be summarised within the ontological assumption that 'humanity is inseparable from nature' (Naess, 1989: 2). The corollary of this is that if humanity causes harm to the environment it causes harm to itself. Suzuki (1997: 102) explains this process stating 'the interconnectedness of all things on Earth means that everything we do has consequences which reverberate through the systems of which we are a part'. One need only think of the radioactive material carried on the wind from Chernobyl and deposited on Scottish soils, or how deposits of sulphur were carried on the wind from power station emissions in the UK and deposited as rain acidifying the lakes of Scandinavia (Reid, 1995). These examples show how geophysical cycles can redistribute pollutants beyond their original sources. The distribution of pollutants can also have biotic consequences. This point was most famously made with the publication of Rachel Carson's *Silent Spring* (1965) which demonstrated how chemical pesticides applied to crops work their way into food chains having consequences for human health. It is these cycles and ecological connections that are the source of what Suzuki (1997) and Naess (1989) mean when talking about interconnectedness. They call themselves ecologists, as Marshall (1995: 413) observes, 'because they embrace the central insight of ecology that there is an intermingling of all parts of the universe'.

The question now arises as to the position of human beings within these interconnections. Despite the evolutionary advances of the human condition (notably through the development of the brain), and the standards of living which this has brought to certain parts of the world (through the development of science and technology) one inalienable fact remains. Human beings depend on the natural environment, at a biological level, for the air breathed, nutritious food and clean water for healthy living. Nature also absorbs human waste (industrial and domestic) whilst providing life support systems such as climate stability, photosynthesis and protection from ultra-violet radiation (Wackernagel and Rees, 1996).

Developing this theme Suzuki (1997: 130) locates human beings within, and dependent on, nature stating that,

you and I don't end at our fingertips or skin - we are connected through air, water and soil; we are animated by the same energy from the same source in the sky above. We *are* quite literally air, water, soil, energy and other living creatures.

The corollary of this is that, despite scientific and technological advances, human beings as individuals, communities, and ultimately a social order, remain rooted in the natural world and dependent on the natural processes which maintain it. Wackernagel and Rees (1996: 7) provide further evidence of the thesis that Suzuki posits stating, 'we are not just *connected* to nature - we *are* nature'. These key concepts of interconnectedness and interdependence are central to deep ecology and have influenced the work of major environmental philosophers (Bateson, 1972; Schumacher, 1974; Thoreau, 1983; Wilson, 1984; Lopez, 1986; Seed, *et al.*, 1988; Leopold, 1989; Muir, 1992; Lovelock, 1995; Smyth, 1995 and Capra, 1996).

Deep ecology strives to 'relate philosophical and valuative premises with the concrete aspects of ecological problems' (Naess, 1989: 65). Current exemplars of global ecological problems would include climate change, species extinction, human population growth and the loss of topsoil. Contemporary issues within the UK media show that the growing of genetically modified crops, the transmission of viruses from salmon farms to native stocks, and radioactive leaks from nuclear reprocessing plants are causing concern. Deep ecology is therefore bound up in the values associated with how people live their lives. This has resulted in some commentators suggesting that deep ecology is 'anarchic' (see Barry, 1999) and 'ecofascist' (see Gore, 1992). However, these are over-zealous interpretations of deep ecology and display a selective interpretation and general misunderstanding of its principles. For example, Gore (the current American presidential candidate) states 'deep ecologists assign our species the role of a global cancer, spreading uncontrollably, metastasizing in our cities and taking for our own nourishment and expansion the resources needed by the planet to maintain its health...(and that they)...seem to define human beings as an alien presence on the Earth' (Gore, 1992: 216-217). Because Gore's reading of deep ecology is based on the assumption that humans are an alien presence, it is fundamentally opposed to Naess's (1989) ontological vision of interconnectedness.

However, these criticisms may be viewed as a useful counterbalance to guard against over-zealous interpretations of deep ecology. This is particularly the case when considering education. In a study of English GCSE environmental education literature, Moodie and Kwong (1997) concluded that the literature depends on an

oversimplification of issues presented in an uncritical manner which can lead to either passive acceptance of sensationalised 'truths' or indoctrination. Furthermore they suggest it is 'doomsday oriented, fear generating...and devoid of science teaching' (Moodie and Kwong, 1997: 87). The problem, they suggest, arises because texts are written from the perspective of the environmentalist as opposed to the educator. In this they make a similar distinction as I made between the advocate (environmentalist) and the scientist (educator). Marshall (1995) identifies the point which distinguishes the two when he suggests environmentalism 'is chiefly preoccupied with clearing up the planet (whereas deep ecology) seeks to change our understanding of ourselves and our place in nature'.

Despite these concerns, an accurate understanding of the intentions of deep ecology shows it to be not a doctrine, nor a code of ethics, but 'a root for practical work' (informed by) 'going deeply into our own experience' (Rothenberg, 1989: 17-19). This is a defining aspect of deep ecology because it is as much a question of ontology as ethics. The difference between the two is that if one truly understands and believes the ontology then one will want to act in accordance with its principles, in which case there is no need to impose a code of ethics. Therefore individuals are not coerced into a particular view but undertake 'a re-examination of how we perceive and construct our world' (Naess, 1989: 19).

This becomes apparent when considering a key concept of deep ecology which is 'self-realization' (Naess, 1989). This should not be confused with the narrow definition of self and ego, but more an extension of self (Harding, 1997). Self-realization is a unity of the ontological and psychological. This is expressed in Naess's (1989: 85) differentiation between acts where,

one may speak of 'beautiful' and of 'moral' action. Moral actions are motivated by acceptance of a moral law, and manifest themselves clearly when acting against inclination. A person acts beautifully when acting benevolently from inclination. Environment is then not felt to be something strange or hostile which we must unfortunately adapt ourselves to, but something valuable which we are inclined to treat with joy and respect, and the overwhelming richness of which we are inclined to use to satisfy our vital needs.

Deep ecology depends on this connection between the ontological and the psychological. The point of 'realization' is internally conditioned rather than externally contrived which confounds the anarchic and ecofascist claims. Deep ecology is not about teaching people what to think but rather what to think about. People are human agents with the power to choose, *they* represent the locus of control. Furthermore, self-realization does not depend on altruistic acts since, as Suzuki (1997:

130) points out, 'humanity has an absolute need to protect biological diversity: it is a matter of sheer self-interest'. It is this understanding of human nature from which an educational philosophy may be established.

Education

The process of self-realization involves an identification with, empathy for, and heightened expansion of concern for non-human life (Harding, 1997). Furthermore, for self-realization to occur we have to 'realize how dependent we are on the well-being of nature for our own physical and psychological well-being' (Harding, 1997: 16). It involves thinking not only of the well-being of human beings but the well-being of human beings within the biosphere they inhabit (Horwood, 1991). Consequently, realization of self includes the realization that nature has intrinsic value (Sessions, 1995). When these statements are juxtaposed with Naess's (1989) view that self-realization depends on the individual's own experience, it follows that pedagogic endeavours relevant to this aspiration should be directed at the way in which individuals experience the natural world.

However, deep ecology adopts the position that there are epistemological barriers to overcome before self-realization can occur. Epistemology, the theory of knowledge, 'seeks to give an account of the nature of *knowing* in general (and) to give accounts of the important related concepts such as belief, certainty and truth' (O'Connor and Carr, 1982: 1). Epistemology is concerned with the sources of knowledge and the variety of modes of acquiring it (O'Connor and Carr, 1982). Since there are different sources of knowledge the question arises, 'are some ways better than others for acquiring knowledge?'

To understand the epistemological barriers which prevent a deep ecological understanding of the world, writers on environmental philosophy often refer to Kuhn's (1962) concept of paradigms. A paradigm is defined as 'a constellation of achievements - concepts, values, techniques etc - shared by a scientific community to define legitimate problems and solutions' (Capra 1996: 5). In this manner knowledge grows incrementally as successive generations within the scientific community conduct research within the dominant paradigm. In this stable environment scientists and researchers operate within the boundaries of what the paradigm deems conventional. Consequently any hypotheses or problems that fall within that paradigm are 'legitimate'. Problems arise when the paradigm fails to recognise something as legitimate. Deep ecology, for example, suggests that the current paradigm not only does not recognise, but works against the type of relationship between human beings and nature that will ensure the long term survival of both (Capra, 1996).

This is why environmental philosophers are attracted to Kuhn's (1962) work. It shows that the world of ideas is not a fixed entity but subject to change. For reasons that will become clear environmental philosophers are frustrated at the hesitation shown by politicians, economists, policy makers and most of the scientific community in dealing with environmental issues. Consequently, they are drawn to examples of change in the social order brought about in the past where scientists have operated beyond conventional boundaries, with the most cited being Copernicus, Newton and Einstein (Orr, 1992). These individuals introduced new ways of understanding the world which challenged, and ultimately changed perceived wisdom. Kuhn (1962) called these changes 'paradigm shifts'. Despite the importance of Kuhn's argument great importance may be placed on what he did not say. Whilst developing the concept of paradigms to demonstrate their existence he stopped short of addressing the relationship between knowledge and societal structures beyond that of the scientific community. He therefore did not ask of himself 'where do our paradigms come from?'

This represents a new and growing source of inquiry within both the natural and social sciences. For example, Feyerabend (1993: x) points to philosophers of biology who posit 'there is not one "science" with clearly defined principles but that science contains a great variety of (high-level theoretical, phenomenological, experimental) approaches...'. Also, within the social sciences, some environmental philosophers have tended towards a realist epistemology drawing inspiration from Marxism and critical theory (eg Fien, 1993; Huckle and Sterling, 1996). Consequently, ideology and other agents of social change (factors traditionally thought of as external to natural science) have emerged as sources of study aimed at determining the extent to which social values, independent of natural science, create and maintain paradigms. Scientific paradigms can now be seen as related to social values and not independent of them. As Rose (1997: 50) suggests 'the claim that (natural) science produces 'truth' about the world is forced even further on the defensive'.

Understanding the mechanisms by which knowledge is constructed and valued is central to a deep ecological understanding of the world. However, despite these developing areas of inquiry one problem remains. The view that science is ethically value free remains entrenched in the consciousness of social institutions where knowledge remains divorced from values (Heron, 1996). This is particularly apparent in Pepper's (1986: 51) claim that historical reasoning ensured that 'nature became composed of objects metaphysically separated from man'. The reason for this is often traced back to Descartes (whose seventeenth-century work aimed at describing the world mathematically helped to establish the philosophical origins of 'modern' science) and the epistemological position of rationalism (Pepper, 1986). Rationalism

has been described as ‘any of a variety of views emphasizing the role or importance of reason...in contrast to sensory experience (feelings)’ (Honderich, 1995: 741). The historical preoccupation with reason established a dualistic pattern which has influenced contemporary thought to the point that,

human beings are the things that think (the only things, and that is all they are), and the rest of the world is made up of things that can be measured (or thought about). Subject or object, mind or body, matter or spirit: this is the dual world we have inhabited ever since...From this duality come the ideas we live by... (Suzuki, 1997: 192).

Suzuki (1997) is suggesting that the dominant paradigm does not allow for a deep ecological understanding of the world. Pepper (1986: 52) concurs stating ‘it was this dualism...which paved the way for a man-nature separation in which the former was conceived of as superior to the latter’. Deep ecology is a reaction against this dominant form of knowing (Horwood, 1991) and the reuniting of knowledge and values is the defining element of deep ecology (Capra, 1996). It is a point identified by Freire (1972) whose pedagogy was based on the assumption that people do not live independently of the world, or more specifically, reality does not exist independent of peoples’ perception of it. In summary, a dominant epistemology exists which does not recognise the concerns of deep ecology. In order for these concerns to be recognised deep ecology posits a change in the way human beings think about and relate to the natural world.

I would like to explore the dualistic paradigm by reframing it within an epistemological position more sensitive to deep ecology. Within this framework I would like to move towards translating the philosophical principles of deep ecology into a framework suitable for understanding and evaluating the pedagogical process germane to outdoor education. This particular endeavour is of vital importance since as Horwood (1991: 24) states, ‘deep ecology literature is strong in philosophical development...it lacks a matching educational framework...’. Consequently, one must look outside the deep ecology literature to find workable educational principles.

Reason (1998) offers a four point epistemology comprising experiential knowing, presentational knowing, propositional knowing and practical knowing. This follows Wittgenstein’s view (in Silverman 1997: 208) ‘that philosophy, properly understood, is not a set of propositions, but an activity, the clarification of non-philosophical problems about the world’. The strength of this form of reasoning is that it recognises multiple forms of knowing which makes for ‘an integrated (but not singular) theory of truth as the congruent articulation of reality’ (Heron, 1996: 168).

Experiential Knowing

Experiential knowing is 'through direct face-to-face encounters with person, place or thing; it is knowing through empathy and resonance...' (Reason, 1998: 44). Orr (1993: 18) argues that 'ecological education will, first, require the re-integration of experience into education'. In another paper Orr (1994a: 6) suggests that 'we experience nature mostly through sight, sound, smell touch and taste - through a medley of sensations that play upon us in complex ways'. Experiential knowing is based on the assumption that 'there is no way to separate feeling from knowledge, or object from subject; there is no good way to separate mind and body from its ecological and emotional context' (Orr, 1993: 17). Consequently, the separation of mind from body is more abstract than real. This point is taken up by Bloom *et al.* (1964: 45) who assert, 'the fact that we attempt to analyse the affective area separately from the cognitive is not intended to suggest that there is a fundamental separation. There is none'. This epistemological way of knowing (experiential knowing) is integrative where 'thought is taken to include feelings' (Horwood, 1991: 23) and provides legitimacy for a subjective reality (Capra, 1996). Experiential knowing represents an epistemological position which addresses concerns which rationalism alone does not. For example, logic may lead us to recognise our integral part within the natural world but Capra (1996: 12) maintains that it is direct 'experience' of it that leads to a deep ecological understanding. The question now arises as to the manner in which this happens.

By adopting an epistemological position which unifies the subject and object (mind and world) cognition is not 'a representation of an independently existing world, but rather a continual bringing forth of a world through the process of living' (Capra, 1996: 260). Donaldson (1978: 68) shares this view suggesting that:

we do not just sit and wait for the world to impinge upon us. We try actively to interpret it, to make sense of it. We grapple with it, we construe it intellectually, *we represent it to ourselves.*

These statements correspond with the epistemological position of constructivist theory where 'participants work to make meaning out of their experience' (DeLay, 1996: 77). This has applications for educators who must recognise that they do not have ultimate control over learning outcomes. As DeLay (1996: 80) points out 'the learner is actively engaged in his or her knowledge construction'. In this way learning becomes an interactive relationship between the teacher, the learner and the natural environment.

Direct experience is foundational to experiential knowing because concentrating solely on bringing forth an *inner* world of concepts, objects and images of ourselves maintains a rationalist epistemology and allows us to remain alienated from from the

natural world (Capra, 1996). This has been compounded with the type of learning where pupils spend most of their educational career in classrooms. This is not a wholesale criticism of class-based education. However, whilst the classroom may be suitable, or even desirable, for some study, it is not useful for integrated study of the natural environment (Orr, 1992) nor should such study be confined to formal institutions (Smyth, 1995). Furthermore, as Orr (1994a: 6) suggests, 'we've organised education like mailbox pigeonholes, by disciplines which are abstractions organised for intellectual convenience'. Consequently, outdoor education represents a pedagogical endeavour with potential for overcoming these abstractions. Without the physical confines of the classroom, nor its subject disciplines, outdoor education offers a way to counteract Orr's (1994a: 7) concern that 'there is a connection between knowledge organised in boxes, minds that stay in those boxes, and the inability of those minds to perceive the causes of degraded ecologies...'. Experiential knowing counters this tendency and educational psychology experiments with young children show that they benefit when experience is direct, compelling and relevant; and further, when the experience is lessened so to is its educational potential (Donaldson, 1978).

Presentational Knowing

If experiential knowing relies on direct experience of the natural environment then there needs to exist a means of identifying quality experience. As Dewey (1963: 25) warned 'the belief that all genuine education comes about through experience does not mean that all experiences are genuinely or equally educative. Experience and education cannot be directly equated to each other'.

Having established that direct experience is only the beginning of a learning process (Donaldson, 1978), Orr (1994a: 7) maintains that it is foundational 'before introducing students to more advanced levels of disciplinary knowledge'. The advanced form to which he refers is the second aspect of this epistemological framework called 'presentational knowing (which)...emerges from experiential knowing, and provides its first expression through forms of imagery such as poetry and story, drawing, sculpture, movement, dance and...sharing of the experience' (Reason, 1998: 44).

This form of knowing allows pupils to reflect on their experiences. In this way the experience becomes a unification of the mind and world as the individual endeavours to internalise the experience and then bring it forth as either talk, text or image. This interaction implies a conscious effort on behalf of the pupil. At this point the role of the teacher becomes apparent. It is to help pupils explore representations of their experience and what that experience means in a wider social and natural context. This is in keeping with Illich's (1996) position that education should be a balance between

personal choice and mentoring.

The role of the teacher is essential because one of the problems with experiential knowing is that it has 'no clear intrinsic moral value' (Horwood, 1991: 23). This means that experiential knowing is a process which gives no guidance as to what is a quality experience. Capra (1996: 289-290) directly addresses this vacuum by suggesting that the non-human world is something to be experienced and since it has 'no language, no consciousness, and no culture; and therefore no justice, nor democracy...We cannot learn anything about those human values from ecosystems'.

Propositional knowing, arising out of experiential knowing, is the basis from which the teacher can use the pupils' own experiences to talk of the way in which the non-human world is valued. This interactive relationship between the pupil and teacher is the starting point of concrete experience. Note that the representation of the experience (talk, text or image) is not solely rational. This is in keeping with various theories that learning is multi-modal (Rogers, 1983). For example the Scottish polymath Patrick Geddes promoted the concept of education relating the heart, hand and head. As his biographer, Boardman (1978: 224), states, 'these terms and their sequence simply meant that priority must be given first to the child's emotional development, thereafter to physical growth, and finally to strictly intellectual training'. Similarly the tripartite model which holds that education is 'in, about and for' the environment (the development of which Jickling and Spork ((1998)) attribute to Arthur Lucas in the late 1970s) can only be effective in relation to affective education (Shallcross, 1996). It is of interest to note that the literature sources who quote these models do so without reference to any empirical foundation. However it would appear that they do indeed have empirical, if retrospective, validity. For example, drawing on interdisciplinary research involving neuroscience, endocrinology and immunology, research has identified a group of molecules known as peptides (a group of molecules which exist in all cells of the body) which 'are the biochemical manifestation of emotions' (Capra, 1996: 275). Because peptides are found throughout the body it becomes less relevant to think of a separation between mind and body. Indeed Capra (1996: 277) states 'this is why we have "gut feelings". We literally feel our emotions in our gut'. This is 'cutting edge', interdisciplinary research and has yet to be recognised by the scientific and educational mainstream. Whereas before emotions were associated with certain parts of the brain this new evidence points to a form of cognition which expands throughout the human body (Capra, 1996). Despite this appearing to challenge perceived wisdom, Gardner's (1993) enquiry into multiple intelligences shows that the perceived wisdom regarding cognition and intelligence has come about through *a priori* forms of knowledge. These are understandings based on the thoughts of reflective individuals. However, Gardner (1993) calls for empirically based models of

understanding so that cognition and intelligence may be investigated whereby the authority lays more on inductive forms of knowledge than deductive. Thus, Gardner (1993) and Capra (1996) believe the present forms of understanding are far from complete. In light of these findings, there are clear implications for education beyond the scope of this thesis involving the structure and balance of education generally and the way it is thought about and delivered. For the moment I will limit my concern to the task in hand.

Propositional Knowing

Children must learn to control their own thinking but they cannot do so unless they are aware of it (Donaldson, 1978). Furthermore, in order to develop control they must project their thinking beyond the context of their immediate world. This introduces the third part of the four point epistemology which involves knowing 'about something through ideas and theories, and is expressed in abstract language or mathematics' (Reason, 1998: 44). Propositional knowing allows pupils to explore the world beyond that of their experiential and presentational knowing. They can critically evaluate text, propositions and theories, looking for strengths and inadequacies and develop their own theories. Donaldson (1978) suggests this way of thinking about theories also serves as recognition that discovery learning is not always possible nor desirable.

For example, direct experience alone cannot convey an understanding of the abstract and symbolic world in which we live. Through propositional knowing pupils can learn about the societal structures which prevent or support a deep ecological understanding of the world. Reid (1995) provides an example of these structures suggesting that the industrial world is consuming natural resources at a rate beyond which they can be replenished. Similarly, Porritt (1984) suggests that the industrial technologies which exploit natural sources cause pollution. Bowers (1993) argues that the industrial world maintains this exploitation because industrial wealth is equated with human progress, which he argues is a cultural myth. This myth is maintained, O'Riordan (1981) suggests, through a technocentric paradigm (rational and exploitative) which dominates the ecocentric paradigm (where nature has value not necessarily defined by human utility). Further readings show that writers and researchers have become concerned about the extent to which technocentric thinking has resulted in psychological alienation. So much so that a new body of literature, called 'ecopsychology', has developed to redefine sanity and mental health by reviewing the relationship between humanity with the non-human world (Roszak *et al.*, 1995). Propositional knowing, therefore, provides the pupil with another form of knowing not accessible by direct experience alone.

I have not attempted to be definitive in the environmental issues expressed here. Instead the examples were used to demonstrate the type of knowledge necessary to deep ecology. In terms of propositional knowing this would consist of understanding ecosystems, the principles of organisation of ecological communities and the social and economic impacts on them from human communities. This type of knowledge has been summarised by Orr (1992: 85) as 'ecological literacy'. This multi-modal epistemology helps pupils to develop constructs to make sense of meaning by organizing their experience into categories. This process works in two directions; first where the direct experience needs to be codified (induction); and second, where theoretical knowledge has to be ordered so as to accommodate new experiences (deduction).

Consequently, a deep ecological understanding of the natural world depends on theoretical (deductive) as well as experiential (inductive) knowledge. The strength of propositional knowing is that it seeks to unite what Kant (1933) and Dewey (1963) saw as the perennial differentiation between theory and practice, where practice without theory is blind. Freire (1972: 68) had the same to say which I have paraphrased as, 'action without reflection is activism, reflection without action is verbalism'. In a similar way Mackenzie (1989: 45) states 'the dissociation between theory and practice of knowledge has bedevilled learning'.

However, accepting the worldview of ecocentrism brings with it certain challenges. This becomes apparent when considering other writers who have been interested in the relationship between education and worldviews. For example, in the foreword to Freire's *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (1972: 16) Richard Schaul introduces these challenges by suggesting that 'there is no such thing as a neutral educational process'. When this view is combined with the definition of experiential knowing above (whereby the world is brought forth), then knowledge becomes pluralistic, socially constructed and consisting of 'multiple realities' (DeLay, 1996: 79). This introduces a very distinct epistemological position summarised by Capra (1996: 40) who suggests 'what we see is not nature itself, but nature exposed to our method of questioning'.

Practical Knowing

This is the fourth form of knowing which involves 'how' to do something and is expressed as a skill, knack or competence' (Reason, 1998: 44). At first glance this practical knowing may very well appear to be the epitome of outdoor education with its focus on outdoor activities. However, I must distinguish between an activity pursued for outcomes inherent in the activity as opposed to one where the activity is pursued for outcomes more directly related to this epistemological position. Developing a 'skill, knack or competence' in, for example, kayaking is a biomechanical function related to

skill acquisition where pupils improve their ability to perform skills necessary to manoeuvre the craft. Consequently, becoming competent at an outdoor activity does not in itself lead to 'self-realization' in the way that deep ecology intends. Action should therefore not be confused with being physically active in outdoor activities. For an alternative view the *5-14 Environmental Studies* (SOED, 1993a: 28-29) document suggests that in developing informed attitudes pupils need to 'think through the various consequences for living things and for the environment of different choices, decisions and courses of *action*' (my emphasis). In this sense action is an outcome of a conscious decision by someone to act, as opposed to simply a willingness to participate in an activity.

For outdoor activities to have deep ecological worth pupils would need to demonstrate competence in relation to deep ecology as opposed to competence in outdoor activities. The type of action to which practical knowing refers is that practised by Freire (1972) where the purpose of education is to improve the social condition. Action is borne out of the belief that the truth is not absolute and out there, but accessible to the individual who can enter into it and transform it (Freire, 1972). From a deep ecology perspective this action is mediated by, and becomes known through, its ontological principle that human beings are part of and not apart from the natural world (Naess, 1989). In this situation the individual's actions are inextricably linked to their values and their knowing. They are a practical expression of attitudes which are emotional and intellectual (Dewey, 1963). Suzuki (1997: 214) takes this a stage further suggesting that 'action invariably precedes a profound shift in values'. Values therefore are at the heart of this educational endeavour. Thus a deep ecological awareness can be realised through this four point epistemology where valid action (practical knowing) 'must be grounded in our experiential, presentational and propositional knowing' (Reason, 1998: 44).

Summary

The purpose of this chapter was to demonstrate a range of environmental problems and explain their ontological, epistemological, ethical and educational implications. In this I have been guided by Schumacher's statement that 'education cannot help us unless it deals with metaphysics...that is to say our fundamental convictions' (Schumacher, 1974: 76). The 'help' needed relates to how society deals with the current degradation of the non-human world. In this I have pointed to deep ecology and its ecological ontology as a 'metaphysics' upon which 'fundamental convictions' may be based. In this way environmental problems and metaphysics become one and the same whereby human beings seek to develop, and perhaps change, their understanding of themselves and their place in nature.

However, as I have pointed out, deep ecology's orientation towards environmental problems and understanding of fundamental convictions (metaphysics), lacks any well developed epistemological position. Consequently there is a missing link between human and non-human existence (ontology) and knowledge of that existence (epistemology). I have bridged this gap by presenting Reason's (1998) four point epistemology which recognises different ways of knowing. This epistemological position rejects the traditional dualisms of mind and world, subject and object, emotional and intellectual and inductive and deductive. As the eminent educational philosopher Alfred North Whitehead wrote 'it is a moot point whether the human hand created the human brain, or the brain created the hand. Certainly the connection is intimate and reciprocal' (Whitehead, 1950: 78). Instead these dualisms are seen as two parts of the same whole where the world is comprised of multiple realities which need to be understood in pluralistic terms and where knowledge is socially constructed. I have presented this as an integrated endeavour comprising of experiential, presentational, propositional and practical modes of enquiry where the prime educational purpose is to understand the relationship between human beings and the non-human world. The challenge now is to determine a role for outdoor education in this.

OUTDOOR EDUCATION: RESEARCH TOPIC OR UNIVERSAL VALUE?

We don't need independent research to prove the value of outdoor education; we believe in it.

McDonald (1997: 377)

It may seem odd to begin a chapter of a research thesis with a quotation which is not only anti-research but adopts a position of self-righteousness whilst promoting a sense of messianic zeal. However, it is precisely because such a statement is presented for public consumption that it is open to question. McDonald (1997) arrived at his conclusion through a combination of personal experience and reasoned judgment but not empirical enquiry. The fact that he has arrived at this conclusion through the power of reason and personal belief causes me no consternation. What does, however, is the substance of the claim. I ask myself who is the homogeneous 'we' that he describes? What is the nature of the people who together constitute the 'we' he refers to and why would they feel that their subject had sufficient universal value that it needed no independent debate and enquiry? How comfortable do I feel as an individual outdoor educator within that collective 'we' that this statement actually represents my own view? Of the outdoor educators I know and have worked with, how do I think this statement actually represents their individual and collective views of outdoor education? I am intrigued by the use of the word 'prove', what is the nature of proof and who are its arbiters? I wonder also if the statement says more about the author than about the profession it is intended to represent but then I don't know, not for sure.

I am left in disagreement with McDonald for two reasons. The first is that it doesn't feel right, not all of it anyway. Intuitively I feel that it represents a hardened dialogue which stifles the development and potential of outdoor education. Secretly, however, I feel an existential harmony with McDonald. When I work with groups in the outdoors there are moments when I do feel that I am one of the 'enlightened' and anybody failing to understand the value of outdoor education obviously needs to get out of their armchair and experience it for themselves, then they would know. In keeping with Reason's (1998) epistemological position presented in Chapter Two (which recognises different ways of knowing) I believe these inner tensions to be healthy and this forms part of my mistrust of McDonald's statement. His statement shows no doubt, only certainty. The intuitive me feels that there is something about outdoor education which is self-evident, whilst the rational me says there are two answers to that. First, it may not be self-evident to *everyone* and therefore research to demonstrate that is pressing. Alternatively, perhaps McDonald is right, in which case research would confirm his statement. In either case no harm is done to the profession and perhaps some

clarification may result.

If I am honest the reason that McDonald's claim irritates me is not whether it is right or wrong, or any shade of grey in between, it is more to do with the arrogance of it. Ultimately, it does not fit with my view of what education is all about. The dogmatic reliance on the unified and homogeneous 'we' is reminiscent of, at best, some benign old boys network and, at worst, a form of educational Fascism where teachers and pupils alike are engineered into one particular way of thinking and believing. This statement, together with the empirical data which I will present, convinces me, contrary to McDonald's (1997) claim, that there is a very real need for 'independent research' and that the research should focus on the very assumptions, values and practices that McDonald appears to believe are inherent and beyond question.

(Outdoor) Education - A Working Definition

One of the key challenges within this thesis is to arrive at conclusions, such as definitional issues, in an emergent fashion. It would therefore be premature to attempt a full definition in advance of my data presentation. However, I have been guided by ideas surrounding definitions of education and these need to be made explicit to identify a starting point at this early stage.

When it was formed in 1970 the National Association of Outdoor Education (NAOE) stated that outdoor education was 'a means of approaching educational objectives' (NAOE, 1970). This has been the definitional template emanating from the NAOE throughout its existence and finds favour amongst contemporary writers (Hopkins and Putnam, 1993; Barrett and Greenaway, 1995; and Keighley, 1998). By concentrating on 'means' the NAOE were suggesting that method, as opposed to content, was the defining element of outdoor education. The method was generally thought about in terms of integrating school subjects and involving direct experience of the countryside (Parker and Meldrum, 1973).

However, despite the concern with method and process the popular conception of outdoor education, I suggest, is that of content. Outdoor activities such as canoeing, kayaking, sailing, skiing, hill walking and rock climbing are all readily associated with outdoor education. These activities have traditionally been categorised as outdoor pursuits which together with field studies represent the two main traditions in outdoor education (Drasdo, 1973; Cooper, 1991). It has been suggested that both traditions have been concerned with skill acquisition. For example, there was a recreational component to outdoor pursuits where learning techniques relevant to, for example, rock climbing, was a desired outcome (Association of Heads of Outdoor Centres, 1988). Field studies on the other hand had an air of educational respectability about them since

they could be readily linked to the school's curricular subjects such as biology, geography and geology (Cooper, 1991). Cooper (1991) argues that the skill acquisition in this context comes from the scientific techniques of observation, measurement, recording, analysis and hypothesis testing.

This has led to debates as to whether outdoor education is formal or informal (Tiffany, 1995a, 1995b and 1996) and poses the question 'in what sense is outdoor education actually education?' In previously unpublished material Crowther (1999: 1) has this to say.

The burdensome fact, that outdoor education has never managed to make the step into statutory recognition, has always presented it with problems of justification that other branches of education have never had to negotiate. One initial difficulty which complicated things was the question about whether it was a subject or an approach to education. There was some logic in the early days for regarding outdoor pursuits as the former, a subject. But what of the present day outdoor education with its amalgam of aims and objectives tied to such diverse items as 'the residential experience', 'personal and social development' and 'conservation studies'. If it is a subject, then, we have to ask, did History or Botany ever have to justify their inclusion within education as outdoor education is asked to? Or were they in early enough to gain unquestioning acceptance? How do you define a subject? Is it by a body of knowledge? If so, then outdoor education today is clearly not defined by a body of knowledge. So it must be the latter, an approach to education!

It would appear therefore that definitions surrounding education are tied up with legitimisation. Crowther's view is not without precedent. Dewey (1963: 28) made a similar point suggesting, 'the traditional school could get along without any consistently developed philosophy of education (with guidance coming from) custom and established routines'. Dewey (1963: 29) continues 'just because progressive schools (for 'progressive schools' try reading 'outdoor education') cannot rely upon established traditions and institutional habits, they must either proceed more or less haphazardly or be directed by ideas which, when they are made articulate and coherent, form a philosophy of education'.

Outdoor education institutions may well have their own 'established traditions' but the point I make is these traditions may not fit into those 'established traditions' which are considered to be education in the sense that English, Maths and Science are. Crowther (1999) therefore has neatly summarised the essential elements of a perennial debate within outdoor education. At its heart are three central but linked questions. First, 'what is considered to be "genuine" education?' Second, 'what are the aims and nature of outdoor education?' Third, 'what is the relationship between mainstream education and outdoor education?'

Outdoor Education - A Historical Perspective

To answer these questions I will show how the assumptions, values practices and justification of outdoor education developed as a dynamic process of change over time. In so doing my intention is threefold; firstly, in charting this process I will show why it is that McDonald (1997) arrived at his conclusion; secondly, I will provide secondary sources which have led others to draw different conclusions; thirdly, I will consider the historical development of outdoor education in ontological and epistemological terms as a basis for analysis.

The research sites selected for this thesis are local authority residential outdoor education centres. However, these centres do not operate in isolation from wider ideas relating to non-residential outdoor education, nor do ideas relating to their development begin with the opening of the first centre in England (Whitehall, 1950) and Scotland (Benmore, 1966). For these reasons this chapter draws on developments which predate the establishment of such centres to demonstrate the effect of external influences and their impact on the nature of current residential provision.

The Development of Residential Outdoor Education

In reviewing the historical development of outdoor education within the United Kingdom generally, and more specifically Scotland, certain themes emerge. In developing a historical context I have consulted primary sources such as statutory instruments to explore the role of the State. I have also referred to secondary sources tending more towards conceptual texts than those whose authors were concerned purely with descriptive information and its attendant focus on the assemblage of dates and events. The nature of emerging themes does not, in this instance, readily fit into such fixed categorisations of time and place. There appears instead to be a series of overlapping trends linked to the growth, and in some cases demise, of outdoor education which is dependent on sectoral rather than national commitment. The secondary sources therefore were selected and consulted since they dealt with the values (individual, organisational and social) behind the facts, looking not just at *what* was happening but *why* it was happening. What follows therefore is a categorisation of emergent themes which are presented as being particular to a certain decade. Whilst acknowledging that there will, in some cases, be overlaps from decade to decade in terms of development and emphasis, the intention is to demonstrate that there are a variety of identifiable sources impinging upon the nature of outdoor education and the way it has come to be understood. Referring to these understandings begins to demonstrate that outdoor education defies definition in terms of being a fixed entity of common consent, homogeneous over time and space. Once this point has been established the assumptions, values, practices and justification of outdoor education

may be more readily understood in a contemporary sense.

1940s: Out of the Ashes - A Brave New World

Whilst the statutory development of outdoor education in the United Kingdom arose out of the 1944 Education Act (Cook, 1999) the Scottish enabling instrument was the 1945 Education (Scotland) Act. The Scottish Act (1945, Part 1, Chapter 37, Section 3) provided Scottish local authorities with the statutory powers to 'establish, maintain and manage...facilities for recreation and social and physical training'. It is worth noting that the Act makes no explicit reference to outdoor education although the above description may be interpreted as including residential outdoor education centres. It is this lack of explicitness which led Crowther (1999: 1) to conclude that 'outdoor education did not have statutory support' which, as history and circumstance will show, proves to be the case.

Both Acts reflect post-war concern with issues of social welfare concomitant with a general broadening of the nature and content of education. Halls (1997: 12) cites the case of the city of Glasgow which established a series of residential primary schools which were 'inspired by ideologies of social welfare'. Pupils were drawn from areas of multiple deprivation and spent up to six weeks at a centre where their social and emotional needs were considered to be as important as their more formal academic needs. Notwithstanding the fact that the educational curriculum remained the same as would be expected in any other primary school, Halls (1997b: 12) continues, 'there was an emphasis on good food and a general concern for the physical welfare of the pupils (and) attendance was looked upon as a recuperative holiday'.

Two other points from this study of Glasgow are relevant. The first is the relationship and the roles that existed between resident teachers, visiting teachers and domestic staff. In this instance both sets of teachers worked together in delivering the curriculum whilst the degree of emphasis on pastoral care meant that 'the domestic staff were as important as the teachers and greatly outnumbered them' (Halls, 1997b: 12). This is in keeping with 'progressive' ideas about education where the welfare of children was seen as indivisible from their more formal education (Mackenzie, 1963).

The second point arises out of the differing aims of social education. In the case of Glasgow the aim was to 'make a contribution to the quality of life of people who were deprived as a result of poverty' (Halls, 1997b: 12). This aim contrasts with what Halls (1997b: 13) refers to as 'other ideologies of education' which can be summarised into two discrete categories; the first being, 'rehabilitating morally or psychologically dysfunctional people'; and the second, 'developing the "characters" of people destined for a leadership role in industry'. Hopkins and Putnam (1993: 49-50)

recognise the latter point suggesting 'a central concern for much of the post-war period was to find appropriate methods for preparing young people for life in a working environment'.

Implicit within Halls (1997a and 1997b) analysis is that, in the case of Glasgow, the aim of outdoor education may be seen to be intrinsic. This is to say that there was a belief that the experience was in itself sufficient justification. There is a concern for the individual in their own right which is apparent in the words 'contribution to the quality of life' (Halls, 1997b: 12).

In the 'other ideologies' to which Halls refers, there is an overt attempt to engage in transformative experiences whereby the aims are not simply intrinsic. The use of the term 'rehabilitation' implies that there are societal and cultural norms into which some pupils do not fit and there is a pedagogic role for outdoor education so that those falling short of the standards are educated into them. Likewise preparing the 'characters' of individuals for industry implies that the experiences from outdoor education are manufactured not simply for the benefit of the individual but in line with a particular social agenda.

However, despite the more overt instrumental claims, the notion that something may have some intrinsic worth does not necessarily mean that there is no hidden agenda. There is evidence to suggest that simply participating in 'rugged' outdoor activities was believed to be a means of resolving a number of other social issues. Cook (1999: 158) points to how the rationale for outdoor education 'swung between "fitness for war" and attempts to reduce the incidence of juvenile delinquency'. Additional to this was the belief that providing students with new situations would assist in breaking down class barriers; that outdoor activities would provide students with socially acceptable leisure activities; and that active participation was a means to improve health. These are examples of the 'other ideologies' to which Halls (1997b) refers.

These themes are in evidence in the early stages of the Outward Bound movement characterised by a fourfold achievement involving the attainment of physical skills, technical skills relating to sailing, an expedition, and service to the local community (Hogan, 1968). Hopkins and Putnam (1993: 29) suggest that part of the rationale behind this approach was 'to enhance among young merchant seamen the physical and moral requirements for survival at sea after ships went down to enemy submarines'. Thus it can be seen that even though the activities of outdoor education may have intrinsic value it became apparent that the aims of the Outward Bound movement were not simply intrinsic and psychological but instrumental and social (Roberts *et al.*, 1974).

In research conducted throughout the Outward Bound movement Roberts *et al.* (1974) found that there was a *belief* amongst staff that a commitment to community service would engender social harmony; that participation on courses led to the break down of class barriers and help dissolve social antagonisms; all of which, it was believed, would contribute to the common good. Although his research was more sociological than educational this work raises some important questions as to the legitimacy of education and who it is that defines legitimacy. For example, one finding was that 'the development of compliance during a course is particularly likely to provoke favourable comment from instructor staff'. There is an essence of social engineering here. Take for instance the concept of hegemony which has been defined as:

the continuing achievement by a class or class fraction or alliance, of leadership over the rest of society, in accordance with its perceived interests. It is a power relation in which the balance between the use of force and coercion, on the one hand, and voluntary compliance with the exercise of power on the other, is shifted so that power relations function largely in terms of the latter mode (Hargreaves, 1986: 7).

The belief that a common good exists implies that there also exists an appropriate set of 'dominant' values and that the instructor's role is to purvey those values. There is a clear agenda to create citizens and leaders with these pre-defined qualities and dispositions. These approaches to education found legitimacy in the Norwood report (1943) which suggested that young people might derive 'moral strength from adventurous land and water based tasks' (Parker and Meldrum, 1973: 34).

At this point therefore it is possible to identify the social context in which post-war outdoor education developed (for a history of the the early twentieth century see Nicol, *et al.*, 1999; Cook, 1999). The state supported agenda of developing character and leadership may be traced through documents such as the Norwood report (1943) and the historical analysis of Hopkins and Putnam (1993), Halls (1997a and 1997b) and Cook (1999). This agenda filtered through into the aims and objectives of the Outward Bound movement and has been portrayed by Roberts *et al.* (1974) as an ideology based on social engineering. At this early stage it is worth pointing out that there was 'little or no emphasis on environmental understanding except that it provided challenges and was often pleasant to be in' (Cheesmond, 1999: 1).

1950s: Green Shoots

The commitment to military and civic objectives continued into this decade. Expected learning outcomes included teamwork, obeying orders, loyalty, the ability to inspire others in adverse conditions, all of which Halls (1997b: 14) describes as 'the morally acceptable alternative to war'. Halls (1997b) suggests that the expansion of this

philosophy created an ethos into which local authority residential outdoor education centres emerged. This ethos was to have a direct influence on how these centres operated and key individuals stand out in this respect. As chief education officer of Derbyshire Jack Longland was responsible for the establishment of Whitehall, the first local authority residential outdoor education centre in the United Kingdom (Cheesmond, 1999; Cook, 1999). Longland had been influenced by the ideas of Kurt Hahn and the Outward Bound movement through the trialling of one of Hahn's projects, the County Badge Scheme (Cook, 1999). The employment of demobilised military officers and other ranks within local authority centres (Cheesmond, 1999; Crowther, 1999) reinforced the ethos of outdoor education being something derived from the military which, as Cheesmond (1999) suggests, was understandable given the recent proximity to the war. In this manner key individuals graduated to responsible positions thereby maintaining this particular ethos. The scene was set for this ethos to expand and infiltrate this embryonic profession as new centres were opened and new employment became available in the voluntary and public sectors.

Local authority developments in England also informed Scottish provision with, in the case of Edinburgh (later Lothian Region), the appointment of senior directors to education departments whose experience and personal contacts were formed as a result of employment in English local authorities (Cheesmond and Yates, 1979). To test this lineage I sought to identify and authenticate an actual example through personal contact with influential individuals. To maintain the narrative of this I will need to project beyond the current decade (1950s).

I made contact with John Cheesmond who suggested I contact Roger Mansfield, a previous principal at Scotland's first local authority centre (Benmore Adventure and Expedition Centre (1969-75)). The resulting communication revealed that John Cook (not to be confused with Cook, 1999) was an assistant education officer in Derbyshire where Jack Longland was chief education officer (Mansfield, 1999).

John Cook took up an appointment in North Yorkshire and was influenced by Jim Hogan who had a long involvement in the development of Outward Bound. In 1964 John Cook left North Yorkshire and was appointed Lothian's depute director of education and in 1966 opened Benmore (Cheesmond and Yates, 1979). Mansfield (1999: 1) takes up the story:

the first principal at Benmore was Ralph Blain whose background experience was entirely Outward Bound. Ralph Blain wanted the students to be physically challenged and stretched in courses that had a very similar format to the Outward Bound 28 day courses. This was reflected in the content of the twelve day programme which was structured towards a final expedition and throughout pupils were pushed into experiences.

Thus the Outward Bound connection can be traced from Jack Longland and Jim Hogan through John Cook to Ralph Blain and the eventual programme delivery at Benmore.

To return to the 1950s, it is now possible to distinguish between two distinct strands of influence on the developing provision of residential outdoor education in Scotland. The first is sectoral (public, voluntary and charitable sectors) whilst the second is geographical (Scotland and England).

This short history provides a framework to understand and contextualise the forming and changing of certain aspects of period social values. Thus it should be remembered that at this point public consciousness was still influenced by compulsory national service reinforcing the view of military use of the countryside. Since military manoeuvres were designed to cultivate those qualities expected of members of the armed forces it is not difficult to see how easy it was for outdoor education to absorb this ethos. Linking this social context to the practice of outdoor education Halls (1997b: 14) suggests that 'the idea developed that outdoor pursuits centres had a role in cultivating obedience, discipline and compliance with middle class values amongst unruly youngsters...'.

Elsewhere in the early 1950s significant developments occurred at Glenmore Lodge, the modern manifestation of which is the Scottish National Outdoor Training Centre near Aviemore. The 'character building' aims of outdoor education continued at Glenmore Lodge but there are indications that ideas relating to outdoor education were both changing and diversifying. For example, the first two principals were both mountaineers with previous physical recreation experience. Selection of instructor staff was dependent not on military service but the possession of certain qualities relating to aesthetic appreciation of the countryside. The purpose of 'the Lodge', at that time, was to use the natural environment 'to experiment with forms of education which will assist the individual to discover his or her physical, mental and spiritual potentialities' (Loader, 1952: 14). Residential visits from teacher training colleges, amongst them Moray House in Edinburgh and Jordanhill in Glasgow, led Loader (1952: 33) to conclude that these institutional arrangements were 'a great advance in the educational sphere (and that) education is a lifelong process' (Loader, 1952: 17). This is a book that very rarely features in the referenced work of writers on outdoor education and represents something of a 'forgotten' text, yet here is the first post-war educational experiment to advance such expansive claims aimed at such a diverse range of user groups.

Glenmore Lodge was providing outdoor courses aiming 'to give training to men and women who are interested in outdoor life and who are willing to pass on their knowledge to those who have never experienced the simple pleasure of country life' (Loader, 1952: 26). The underpinning rationale of the early Glenmore Lodge courses was that of a holiday training course, terminology very similar to the recuperative holiday theme of Glasgow's residential schools.

From these descriptions it is possible to deduce that outdoor activities had a high recreational value. There were however programmes designed to develop an interest in the countryside through field studies. Not only was the course content diversifying but so too was the client base to include groups from the civil service, naturalist clubs, holiday courses, secondary school groups as well as groups from teacher training colleges. Courses based on leadership, learning outdoor activities for sporting purposes, field studies and living residentially were all intended to inculcate an appreciation of outdoor life, to learn about the countryside and develop a sense of comradeship. However, commenting on potential learning outcomes Loader (1952: 24) makes the point that it was 'difficult to assess the possible permanent results of spending (time) at Glenmore'. She is talking not only of learning an outdoor skill, nor how much the experience has been enjoyed, but more the extent to which that experience has learning opportunities beyond the immediate relevance of the present. This is most apparent in Loader's (1952: 24) anecdotal and somewhat ambiguous claim that as a result of participation students 'acquire a zest for living'. I conclude therefore that the ability to measure or evaluate outcomes, in a systematic manner, proved elusive.

At this point elements of liberal education associated with 'progressive' ideals were influencing the nature of outdoor education. The work of R. F. Mackenzie is an example of educational experimentation more directly linking curricular education with outdoor education. Mackenzie (1963, 1989) believed that outdoor trips to the countryside represented a powerful educational opportunity to enhance and, to some extent, replace the formal timetable of his school's curriculum. Having developed a successful programme of visits around Scotland using temporary residential bases Mackenzie decided that a permanent base was needed. Mathematics would be learnt through such means as profit and loss accounting during the renovation of a purpose built residential outdoor centre in the Scottish Highlands. Many aspects of the curriculum were already taught in this manner with the guiding principle being that effective learning depended on the personal involvement and direct experience of pupils. The battles of Montrose and Claverhouse; the angst of the Highland Clearances, the economic web of rural life came alive in a revised and outdoor form of educational endeavour. Mackenzie (1989: 45) challenged his pupils, 'cease to be ruled

by dogmas and authorities', a clear distinction from the qualities promoted at Outward Bound which favoured compliant students.

However, in order for these visits to the Scottish Highlands to take place parents had to fund their childrens' expenses. Coming from an urban area, identified by Mackenzie (1963) as economically disadvantaged, this placed an intolerable burden on family funding. In the absence of core funding from the local authority the school staff and pupils had to fund-raise and seek private sponsorship. The energy and commitment eventually expired and with it the attempt to establish a permanent residential outdoor education base. It is possible to conclude that the project failed because of lack of funds. However, another explanation can be proposed.

When new ideas such as these are postulated invisible hegemonic processes are likely to become more explicit. For example some parents thought that this was not 'real' education as it was so unlike their own. It invited suspicion from the education authority and public at large who felt uncomfortable with new ideas about education. This led Mackenzie (1989: 63) to conclude that, 'there is an inconclusive battle between those who try to make permanent the existing pattern of ideas because it is comfortable for them and those who want to change it because it isn't'. Despite the apparent failure of Mackenzie's endeavours, the rationale for providing experiences in the outdoors can now be seen shifting from preparation for war and survival at sea to a general belief that being in the outdoors was good for you and could be linked to the school curriculum through both formal and non-formal approaches.

Whereas Mackenzie's view of outdoor education linked learning to the school curriculum (but drawing on alternative contexts and modes of delivery), the view developed in outdoor centres that education was not linked to the curriculum. Reflecting on his own experiences as a centre principal Noble (1995: 20) suggests, 'it was so simple, so clean so wholesome back in the 50s and 60s. We didn't talk about outdoor education, at least not as a generic term. We went camping or climbing and occasionally canoeing,...and it was fun, buoyed on by spontaneity, energy, excitement and lack of criticism or justification'. Cheesmond (1999: 1) concurs suggesting 'everyone (the students) seemed to be having such a good time and coming back for more'. Here therefore is another indication of change as to the purpose of outdoor education in relation to its military past. Cheesmond further suggests that even if some aspects of the style may have been militaristic, most of the activities were not intrinsically militaristic. These signals of change and differing perceptions may be understood as a transitory relationship whereby use of the natural environment is moving from that of battleground to playground.

Whitehall's one time principal (Lyn Noble) has stated that 'at the outset, Whitehall was primarily concerned with outdoor pursuits. The belief in their intrinsic value went virtually unquestioned...personal development was bound to happen!' (in Hopkins and Putnam, 1993: 36). Confirmatory evidence that this belief prevailed comes from Cheesmond (1999) who was employed at Whitehall prior to Noble's arrival. This therefore is a retrospective summary of one of the instrumental qualities early outdoor educators were trying to achieve (personal development). However, there appears to be a latent tension between those who believed that the practice of outdoor education was worthwhile in its own right (such as Noble) and those, who believed that there was some instrumental, still to be defined, value to which outdoor educators aspired (such as Loader). Crowther (1999: 1) explains,

the original instructors were almost without exception individuals who performed in the pursuits (mostly mountaineering) at high standards. Their immersion in these pursuits derived from either recreation or military backgrounds. In both cases, questioning the validity of outdoor pursuits was never seriously grappled with by either. It was rather like 'empire', 'monarchy' and 'manhood' - self evidently good! If it wasn't, would we not have to re-evaluate our heroes, Shackleton, Mallory, Scott and their ilk? - the imperial legacy!

In summary the 1950s were characterised by an era of expansion in outdoor education (Hopkins and Putnam, 1993) and diversification (Loader, 1952). This expansion within the public, voluntary and charitable sectors had its roots in five distinct areas. First, the military concern with character building through adventure training; second, the growth of the Outward Bound movement with its focus on a form of citizenship where the student would engage in militaristic and civic activities to benefit self, community and society; third, the use of residential schools to address the inequalities of urban life through welfare programmes; fourth, individual school teachers taking pupils out of the classroom to engage in direct experience of the countryside; and fifth, the exploratory approaches to education developed at Glenmore Lodge.

Within this context of differing assumptions therefore is the beginning of a rift between practitioners of outdoor education. Perhaps this is best understood by extending an earlier metaphor. I suggested that the relationship enjoyed between practitioners and the natural environment had moved from battleground, to playground. McDonald (1997) suggests another dimension to this metaphor whereby, during the course of pursuing personal and social development objectives, the playground is increasingly used in lieu of the psychiatrist's chair.

1960s: The Golden Years

The general expansion of outdoor education within the United Kingdom continued into

this decade (Hopkins and Putnam, 1993). Corresponding growth took place particularly within the Scottish public sector seeing Edinburgh invest in two residential centres with Benmore opened in 1966 and building work starting on Lagganlia in 1969 (Cheesmond and Yates 1979). Investment in infrastructure was supported strategically by developments such as the Brunton report (Scotland), published in 1963, arguing for 'more diversity in physical education through more outdoor pursuits and a better understanding of environment' (Hopkins and Putnam, 1993: 47). This report, it is argued, 'helped to inspire a substantial expansion of adventure education in Scotland in the following decade' (Hopkins and Putnam, 1993: 47). The Newsom Report (England), published in 1963, promoted the use of extra-curricular activities, new teaching methods and emphasised the provision of 'some residential experience for all pupils in the course of their school life' (Newsom, 1963: xvi). The Scottish Education Department's 1965 policy document *Primary Education in Scotland* (also known as *The Primary Memorandum*) came to be 'regarded as the epitome of child-centredness...which saw pupils as active in their own learning' (Adams, 1999: 349-350).

With these developments came a concern about content and nomenclature. Much of the content involved adventurous sports such as mountain walking, camping and rockclimbing and these activities came to be known as 'outdoor activities' as well as 'outdoor pursuits'. As the Association of Heads of Outdoor Education Centres (AHOEC) (1988: 12) observes 'the chief concern was to introduce the skills or knowledge that would eventually lead to participants being self sufficient in leisure activities'. Referring to outdoor pursuits Parker (1970: 3) argues that 'it is quite unnecessary to either know or justify one's reasons for participating in anything'. Once again this reinforces the view amongst some writers that activities at this time were considered worthwhile for their own sake, or as a means of developing a leisure interest (Noble, 1995; McDonald, 1997).

Whilst Parker (1970: 5) acknowledges that in the process of engaging in activities 'there may be as many occasions when selfishness and other less socially acceptable traits become apparent', he does not see the educators central role as dealing with those issues. This is quite distinct from a growing tendency of seeing the development of other qualities arising out of participating in the activities as more important than activities themselves. There was recognition that the activities in themselves had insufficient educational justification and that the focus should be the nurturing of personal and social qualities through outdoor activities. Hopkins and Putnam (1993: 49) suggest that 'adventure experiences, particularly in the residential context, were...recognised in the 1960s and 1970s as a potent instrument for developing self-esteem and enhancing social responsibility for alienated and underachieving young

people’.

Some measure of statutory support can be found in the Education (Scotland) Act 1969 which empowered education authorities to provide ‘adequate facilities for social, cultural and recreative activities and for physical education and training’. However, it should be remembered that this Act does not specifically mention outdoor education nor does it provide for the building of new residential centres.

It is within this context of competing claims and counter claims and tenuous statutory support that Cheesmond and Yates (1979: 5) summarise that the rationale of outdoor centres at this time was to ‘integrate the skills for leisure approach...with modified aspects of personal and social development ...and a measure of environmental understanding...Depending on various factors, one or other of these might receive more emphasis in some centres than in others’.

Environmental understanding was promoted in the policy document *Primary Education in Scotland*. Whilst not specifically aimed at the outdoor environment there is a recognition that the school plays only a part of the child's education. The document states ‘ideally...experience should be first-hand...teachers...should be prepared, in the quest for ‘real life’ experiences for their pupils, to break out of the confines of the classroom and to exploit other areas within the school and its grounds or beyond the bounds of the school altogether’ (SED, 1965: 13-14).

Once again there are observable, discrete and differentiated claims being made as to the purpose of outdoor education. At this point these can be separated into four strands:

1. Recreation: where activities are pursued for the intrinsic enjoyment of pupils
2. Leisure education: to stimulate interest in the activity as a sport
3. Personal and social development: using the activities and residential experience as vehicles to develop personal and social qualities
4. An understanding of the environment.

1970s: A New Kid in Town

In 1971 the Scottish Education Department published a circular in response to the growing provision and importance attached to outdoor education. The intention was to assist education authorities and school managers to prioritise those aspects of outdoor education which would contribute to the general education of pupils. It is a supportive document suggesting that pupils should have a ‘continuous and progressive outdoor experience...including, if possible, at least one period of residence at an outdoor centre’

(SED, 1971, 804 [I]: 1). The importance of this document lies not only with its general support of outdoor education but in dealing with definitional aspects such as the recognition that outdoor education is an umbrella term comprising a broad range of component parts. For example, three distinct areas of outdoor education are identified and include outdoor pursuits, curriculum field studies and social education. However, the circular points out that each component has been treated with unequal status and states that, 'less attention seems to have been paid to social education at outdoor centres' (SED, 1971, 804 [I]: 1).

Here then is an explicit and official indication of the role that the Scottish Office expects of outdoor education (social education). Whether intended or not it also represents a challenge to the body of thought which held that to engage in outdoor pursuits for their own sake is sufficient intrinsic justification. It would also appear to represent a counter to the 'skills for leisure approach'. The SED report therefore was championing the view that the pursuit of activities on a recreational basis was not enough and that instrumental outcomes were required.

Nomenclature

During this time the use of the term 'outdoor education', as opposed to 'outdoor pursuits' or 'outdoor activities', became more prominent. Cheesmond and Yates (1979) suggest that this is directly attributable to the formation, in 1970, of the National Association for Outdoor Education (NAOE). By adopting the term 'outdoor education' within its own title the Association was endorsing its use as the favoured term. Cheesmond (1981: 14) suggests that the choice of the term signified the intention to draw together divergent outdoor practices within 'a broadly based definition which, it was hoped, would appeal to a wide variety of teachers'.

That outdoor education became a favoured term instead of outdoor pursuits is directly attributable to the attempt to link it with the school curriculum. In order to do this it had to gain respectability from within the mainstream educational establishment. Cheesmond (1981: 28) suggests that 'outdoor education as opposed to pursuits can be seen as an example of a trend in education towards subject integration. It represents a subject amalgamation, an applied area of knowledge which draws from several established parts of the school curriculum'. This was a deliberate attempt to establish validity by using nomenclature that would appear acceptable and fit in with the established curriculum. In terms of curricular subjects the most accommodating subject was physical education (Cheesmond, 1981; Yates, 1981; Keighley, 1998). Environmental education offered a second means by which outdoor education could claim to be involved in curricular subjects (Parker and Meldrum, 1973). Residential visits presented opportunities for pupils to become involved in curricular field studies.

Opportunities such as these strengthened the potential for links with school based education.

At this point it is possible to say with assurance that outdoor education had become something more than outdoor activities, with policy documents supporting the areas of personal and social development or environmental education. Also, outdoor education was increasingly seen as an innovative pedagogical endeavour. For example, the General Teaching Council for Scotland (1990: 3) reported that in the 1970s outdoor education represented a 'shift from passive learning to active inquiry methods'. At this stage the future of outdoor education with its alternative methodological practices looked optimistic.

The 'Game' Becomes Deadly

However much outdoor educators may have wanted to be guided by issues of pedagogy, external developments took precedence in shaping the nature of outdoor education. A series of incidents resulted in the deaths of children whilst engaged in outdoor programmes (Mortlock, 1984; AHOEC, 1988). The resultant public concern called into question the educational justification for such adventurous activities (Hopkins and Putnam, 1993). The aspiring outdoor profession responded by adopting a more prescriptive approach to safety (AHOEC, 1988) and a general clarification and tightening of safety procedures (Hopkins and Putnam 1993). This reinforced an existing trend where a codified hierarchy of qualifications represented the means by which outdoor educators could evaluate their professional competence (Cheesmond, 1981).

The deaths of the pupils was a turning point in the development of outdoor education. Crowther (1999) states that the response to these incidents was the introduction of training courses for teachers of outdoor education at Edinburgh's Moray House and Dunfermline colleges. They also coincided with developments in the wider recreational arena where National Governing Bodies (NGBs) were responsible for the establishment of a range of qualifications in outdoor pursuits (Cheesmond and Yates, 1979). Given the absence of formal recognition and lack of promotion prospects the pursuit of qualifications became a measure of professional reflexivity for instructors. Thus it can be seen that the nature of outdoor education came to be influenced by, on the one hand, the pursuit of qualifications, and on the other, academic influences from tertiary education institutions.

The First Philosophical Treatments

Mortlock (1984) saw this as a key turning point in philosophy. Up to this point

educational benefits were seen to arise out of placing pupils in positions where they would experience adventure, fear, physical hardship and discomfort. However, the public's concern for safety, the developing trend for instructors to pursue qualifications, together with a desire to secure a place in the school curriculum, provided the seed bed from which new ideas about outdoor education would germinate. Mortlock (1984: 13) wanted to challenge the view that 'by combining outdoor activities with environmental and field studies, educational and academic respectability were achieved'. Mortlock was an experimentalist and did not necessarily concur with this form of 'respectability'. He published two essays which represented a direct challenge and rebuttal of the public concern over risk (Mortlock, 1973 and 1978). By carefully redefining the notion of risk Mortlock developed the concept of 'adventure education'. Central to his thesis was that elements of risk and adventure, properly managed, could be used to heighten learning experiences in areas of 'courage, compassion, determination, integrity, humility and self reliance' (Mortlock, 1984: 17).

A contemporary of Mortlock, Harold Drasdo published a critique of outdoor centres suggesting they were failing to provide experiences which would lead to self-fulfilment and personal growth (Drasdo, 1973). Like Mortlock, Drasdo's concerns were as much about the nature of experience as they were about the content of outdoor education. Focussing on the phenomenological rather than the technical provided new opportunities for the rationale of outdoor education. Drasdo was particularly interested in the aesthetic element. In this he was not the first but his contribution was at that time the most eloquent and advanced. I have written elsewhere (Nicol and Higgins, 1998: 50) that:

Drasdo's experiential involvement as a climber provided him with a feeling for the activity to which he felt the goals of outdoor education should be directed. In what must now be seen as a pioneering book on *Education and the Mountain Centres* Drasdo (1973: 16) suggests 'the climber's lonely dance is infinitely expressive. The cliff writes the choreography, the weather reinterprets it, the climber reveals himself through it in his own performance'. This sentiment will strike a chord in all climbers remembering their own moments of oneness where a collection of movements became a unity of physical and mental experience, where the climb becomes more of a flow of graceful movements than a series of physical exertions.

Drasdo's contribution is a landmark publication that marks a break from the traditional view that outdoor education consisted simply of field studies, or a series of 'rugged' activities. By introducing an aesthetic dimension Drasdo challenged his contemporaries to rethink their relationship with the natural environment and the whole purpose of outdoor education as a pedagogical endeavour. It should be noted that Drasdo met with limited success and came to admit that the outlook of many of the

newly established centres did not fully reflect his own philosophy. However, both he and Mortlock (1984) draw on a similar philosophical position that, I have argued, is rooted in a particular perspective,

that is to say, the individual who has enjoyed those experiences that Drasdo talks of will instantly relate to this relationship between self, activity and the environment but at a *personal* level. Colin Mortlock has, in his own way expressed similar existential tendencies. His (1984: 58) use of Schopenhauer's phrase 'know thyself and know the world' goes to the very heart of a personal philosophy whereby enlightenment begins with knowledge of self. Perhaps the most telling aspect of Mortlock's (1984: 4) philosophy is expressed in his description of the 'inner journey' which appears at once both metaphorical and literal: 'Your success is determined by your efforts and not by your results, and you may come to realise that the most important journey is the journey inwards' (Nicol and Higgins, 1998: 51).

Despite these embryonic engagements no further philosophical treatments of outdoor education appeared until 1993 when Hopkins and Putnam published *Personal Growth Through Adventure*.

However, another early publication appeared at this time which was *Outdoor Education* (Parker and Meldrum, 1973). Whilst advancing the claims of outdoor education it did so in a descriptive manner stopping short of an interpretive critique of the roles, aims and objectives of outdoor education. Indeed they comment that 'there is certainly the need to clarify the aims of sending young people to centres...(and warn that whatever outdoor education)...does contain or expand into should be educationally sound and born out of proven evidence and not intuition' (Parker and Meldrum, 1973: 19). Here then is an indication of unease over a profession short on both philosophical and empirical rationales. The strength of this text however lies in its concern with an overview of outdoor education. Whereas both Drasdo (1973) and Mortlock (1984) focussed on ideas that were foremost to them as individuals, Parker and Meldrum cast their net wider to include historical, contemporary, technical and definitional aspects of outdoor education within the context of public, charitable, voluntary and commercial modes of provision.

In terms of landmark publications the 1975 Dartington conference was the first 'systematic attempt...to identify and categorise the different goals of outdoor education and to identify the process by which they might be achieved' (Hopkins and Putnam, 1993: 45). Convened under the auspices of the Department of Education and Science the conference clarified definitions, aims and content in the following way.

• Definitions

In recognising that the term outdoor education had many meanings the Dartington conference findings took issue with the National Association for Outdoor Education definition as a 'means of approaching educational objectives through guided direct experience in the environment, using its resources as learning materials' suggesting that it 'does not help to identify and emphasise certain important educational aims' (DES, 1975: 1). The definition offered instead was that outdoor education was 'education out of doors...including disciplines such as geography, history, art, biology field work, environmental studies and physical education'. These proceedings offer further confirmation of the growing tendency to favour instrumental aims and curricular links over intrinsic aspects. Furthermore, there was no overt attempt to translate the philosophical writings of Drasdo and Mortlock into the diverse practitioner contexts which exist.

• Aims

The aims that were adopted at the Dartington conference have shown much resilience since they remain observable in current texts (Hopkins and Putnam, 1993). These aims, after Mortlock (1973), were to heighten awareness of and foster respect for:

- a. Self - through the meeting of challenge (adventure)
- b. Others - through group experiences and the sharing of decisions
- c. The natural environment, through direct experience (DES, 1975: 1).

These aims were a formulation of what conference delegates already perceived their job to be. However, the aims were not arrived at as the result of empirical analysis and so there is no evidence to suggest, for example, that by 'heightening awareness' 'respect' would be fostered for any of the three aims. In terms of philosophy Cheesmond (1999: 1) has suggested 'maybe each strand has a distinct philosophical underpinning; the mountaineer, the group worker, the biologist for example, but they have proved to be uncomfortable bedfellows in achieving something overarching'.

This is confirmed later in the DES document where, once again, it is pointed out there is a lack of understanding in philosophical underpinnings (DES, 1975: 4). This raises a fundamental problem which has eluded the outdoor profession to the present time. The basis of the problem is the relationship between philosophy, methodology and practice. If outdoor education lacks a stated philosophy one wonders at the means by which knowledge is produced, verified and transmitted. Without this context outdoor education lacks validity. It may be valid to its practitioners but unless that validity is demonstrable to an external audience then whatever philosophy that exists remains insular.

• Content

The content is described in terms of activities such as expeditions, exploration, canoeing, sailing, hill walking, rockclimbing, gliding and skiing. It is interesting to note that the content of outdoor education is still expressed in terms of activities and this poses a fundamental issue yet to be addressed. In the absence of stated philosophical underpinnings and empirical evidence it is clear that outdoor education has developed, to some extent, as a series of practical activities. Simply put, the practice came first and the theory, what there is of it, came later. This has important epistemological implications which were referred to in the previous chapter when discussing the nature of induction and deduction.

Back to Philosophy

However, outdoor education is not alone in this respect a point which is clearer when viewed within the context of other forms of education. For example, Mackenzie (1963: 53) suggests that 'the story of education is a story of unexamined assumptions'. He cites mathematics as a legacy of 'classical education' which maintains its place in the curriculum because of tradition rather than its useful application to everyday life. This is the point that Crowther (1999) made above, that some subjects are valued because of an unquestioning acceptance which leads to a tradition of supremacy which in turn hinders the inclusion of 'newer' subjects.

Without calling into question all of the subjects deemed worthy of inclusion in the curriculum it is probably more realistic to ask 'at this stage of its development what can outdoor education bring to education to warrant its recognition as a valued educational endeavour?' As an example, Mackenzie (1963: 53) asks that we consider his assumption that a major purpose of education is for young people 'to decide for themselves what education is about'. One of the greatest advantages the outdoor educator has over a class teacher is the ratio they work with. Working normally with groups of less than ten they have potentially more contact time with each particular pupil. The ratio alone provides more opportunity to give the individual attention needed to create ways in which pupils may consider their own perspective on education. In this I am following Mackenzie's (1963) distinction between the purposes to which education is put as opposed to what people learn.

I raise these issues at this stage because it appears that outdoor education has 'evolved' into what it is more by chance than design. Consequently philosophical debate proceeds in defence of what has always been done. However, this should not be seen as any different from those subjects which are seen as foundational to the curricular timetable. In this respect outdoor education shares with mainstream education a philosophy which is more likely to be a reinforcement of the status quo than a

visionary pedagogical endeavour. Where it differs is that outdoor education has never enjoyed statutory protection nor a societal tradition to support it whereas many existing school subjects are considered to be a good thing and beyond question. This leads Crowther (1999:1) to conclude 'it was (with hindsight) in the 1970s that the battle for formal inclusion of outdoor education was lost. The aftermath of the Stimpson Report (the 1976 review entitled *Non-Teaching Staff in Secondary Schools: Youth and Community Workers, Librarians and Instructors*) and the attempts to get outdoor education teachers recognised by the General Teaching Council for Scotland ultimately failed because of rejection by the Scottish Office'.

In summary therefore the 1970s was characterised by issues of safety, qualification, definition and aims. Despite the contributions of Drasdo (1973) and Mortlock (1973, 1978), outdoor education literature failed to provide a coherent philosophical standpoint. These issues were debated against a backdrop of changing provision which saw a progressive decrease in the length of residentials in some centres from 28 days to 8 days and less (Noble, 1995) and with no more residential centres being opened in Scotland towards the end of the 1970s (Cheesmond and Yates, 1979). Within this context of diminishing provision outdoor education was unsuccessful in becoming established as a mainstream school subject supported by statutory authority.

1980s: Trouble at t'Mill

Concern with aims continued into the 1980s leading McDonald (1997: 294) to conclude that by then 'most centres had compiled or written aims'. However the concentration on aims made little contribution to developing an underpinning philosophy. An indication that this was so is apparent in a debate which took place over whether outdoor pursuits had a legitimate place in the school curriculum. The two protagonist are the same Cheesmond and Yates whose empirical study (1979) has featured throughout this chapter. Yates's (1981: 27) position is summed up in his statement, 'I can see little justification for including outdoor pursuits as a compulsory part of the school's programme, and can find no strong argument for the subject which rests its case on educational principles'. He is very sceptical that simply by participating in outdoor pursuits (his terminology) the activity will 'challenge the individual and pose to the individual the need to consider others when engaged in group activities' (Yates, 1981: 30). Cheesmond (1981), on the other hand, argues the case for inclusion on a number of fronts. There is a sociological argument that suggests the stresses of urban lifestyles require a rural antidote which may be found in outdoor pursuits. Also there is a curricular argument where Cheesmond (1981) uses Scottish Education Department documentation (*Physical Education in Secondary Schools: Curriculum Paper 12*) to defend the inclusion of physical activities. In addition both polemicists support their arguments by citing educational philosophers.

In his own words Yates (1981: 30) states,

I might add that I hold to (my) conclusion on philosophical grounds. My personal involvement in an evaluation of the Lothian Region's Outdoor Education Programmes which endorsed in every respect their value as seen by teachers and pupils left me with a very strong admiration for the excellent work and generous commitment of time by a large number of dedicated teachers and advisors, so my conclusion is one reached in relation to fundamental principles rather than current practice.

The project Yates (1981) refers to was a collaborative project undertaken by both himself and Cheesmond (Cheesmond and Yates, 1979). At first glance it may seem strange that both now disagree. Closer analysis, however, reveals the disparity. Yates (1981) suggests that his argument begins with first principles which implies that outdoor pursuits will be critiqued from and evaluated against a particular philosophical standpoint. Cheesmond (1981) on the other hand begins from the point of practice and looks to various policy, curricular and philosophical arguments to support the case. In short Yates (1981) is employing deductive reasoning, going from the general to the specific, whilst Cheesmond (1981) appears to adopt a more inductive approach going from the specific to the general. Without necessarily putting any value on either approach it is imperative that the difference be understood. This is because if an argument begins and is developed from a deductive standpoint it may well have a different conclusion than if it began and was developed from a position of practice (induction).

Of the collaborative work with Cheesmond, Yates (1981: 32) concluded, 'I am unable to provide any answers to these difficult philosophical issues, but would wish to point out that at root many of the problems to which this research project pointed us are problems of this philosophical kind'. The interface between ontological assumptions about the nature of the world (reality) and the epistemological means by which you come to understand that reality has been central to the history of western philosophy. It is possible that Yates (1981) search for first principles to justify practice and Cheesmond's (1981) search for philosophy arising out of practice has its origins within this metaphysical domain. It is also possible that in reflecting upon their collaborative work both protagonists are defending their different positions using post-hoc rationalisation. For the moment, however, this was the limit of the philosophical frontier within outdoor education in the 1980s in the United Kingdom where treatments were both social and justificational. In other words despite approaching the issue from different knowledge construction standpoints (inductive) Cheesmond (1981) and (deductive) Yates (1981), the philosophical battleground remains uncontested from the point of view that both look to instrumental as opposed to intrinsic rationales.

Mortlock expanded on his earlier writings (Mortlock, 1973, 1978) and published *The Adventure Alternative* (Mortlock, 1984). This is a conscious attempt to portray outdoor education as something different from what had gone before. *The Adventure Alternative* is written from personal experience and added an important philosophical element. Whereas earlier treatments took the view that the issues to be resolved were the use of activities, Mortlock's (1984: 4) prime concept of the 'inner journey' indicated that phenomenology, not content, was the key element in outdoor experiences. Like Drasdo (1973) eleven years before Mortlock (1984) believed that the vital ingredient was not what people were doing (activities) but what they were experiencing. The nature of experience (phenomenology) therefore became the defining element which distinguished adventure education from outdoor education.

This in turn offered new educational opportunities particularly within the area of environmental education. Since the defining element was experience Mortlock (1984) could now consider the essence of the relationship between people and the 'natural environment' they encountered. Using references to E. F. Schumacher, John Muir and Henry David Thoreau, Mortlock made some attempt to portray the human and non-human world as a series of interconnections in the manner of deep ecology. However, he does not draw fully on the assumptions inherent in an ecological ontology. For example, he states 'awe and wonder will develop as knowledge and awareness increases' (Mortlock, 1984: 102). The concentration on knowledge and awareness stops short of Naess's (1989) self-realisation as described throughout the previous chapter. However the embryonic attempt to consider the nature of human experience and integrate it with the non-human world represents a milestone in this history.

Residential Centres, Markets and Demand and Extent of Provision

At this time a research report pointed out that between 1970 and 1982, 55 new centres opened bringing the total to 163 outdoor centres in Scotland, 66 of which belonged to local authorities and of these, sixteen were fully staffed (Faulkner, 1983). Whilst the trend, at this time, appears to be one of expanding provision this needs to be considered within the context of divergent demand. For example, the report indicates that the use of some local authority centres is on the increase. At the same time not all centres were operating at full capacity and also that use of centres had been extended to members of the public. This raises the question of whether residential outdoor education is provided for educational purposes or meeting the demand of public recreational consumption.

This tension adds another dimension to what is becoming an increasingly complex understanding of the nature and provision of outdoor education in relation to its consumers. For example, AHOEC (1988) note that the range of activities within

outdoor education at this time expanded to include newcomers such as mountain biking and board sailing. Williams (1994) points to the dramatic growth in popularity of residential education in both the public and private sectors. At the same time trends within countryside recreation show that more people are going into the countryside to pursue an ever increasing range of activities (Harrison, 1991; Dargie and Briggs, 1991). The question might be asked therefore 'what is the relationship between the increasing diversity of public recreational use of the countryside and the parallel patterns developing within outdoor education?' In terms of local authority residential centre provision Faulkner (1983: 16) indicates that outdoor education has a role in both suggesting they are 'a resource of considerable value to both the education and leisure markets'.

From the perspective of delivery, tensions within these 'markets' may not be apparent since many activities remain the same regardless of user groups. However, as I have pointed out above a philosophical argument does not necessarily begin from a starting point of practise, and as Mortlock (1984) has indicated educational value comes from the type of experience people have as opposed to the activity itself. Therefore practise tells little of rationale. There is a fundamental issue at stake here to establish the rationale behind the provision of outdoor education for differing 'markets'. If this issue is not resolved then there is little way of knowing which of the markets is the dominant force in shaping the nature of the amorphous term 'outdoor education'. In this example the tension is between whether public use of the countryside is influencing the nature of outdoor education or vice versa. If the latter is true then there may well be a conflict between whether outdoor educational values should be driven by public recreation. Yates (1981: 28) raised this issue when he suggested that,

the increased popularity of outdoor pursuits has had little to do with the sponsorship of such activities by the educational system, and even less to do with the place of outdoor pursuits within school curricula...The subsequent inclusion of such pursuits within schools therefore was a clear case of activities being justified by their already increased leisure popularity boosted by a trend towards P.E. programmes being increasingly synonymous with leisure education.

Whilst the philosophical and practical debates remained unresolved, local authority provision of outdoor education was at this time increasingly questioned in terms of cost effectiveness (Ernst and Donald, 1993). There was a recognition that outdoor education may be perceived as expensive because of its transport and building maintenance costs. Drawing conclusions from studies conducted in 1970 and 1982 Faulkner (1983: 19) suggests that for financial reasons 'the future of outdoor education centres does not appear as bright as it was at the conclusion of the 1970 survey'. Cheesmond (1999) concurs suggesting that many authorities would have

done better if they had invested more in urban based schemes and less in distant residential centres.

Meantime outdoor educators were becoming increasingly concerned about the impact on the natural environment caused by both education and recreation groups (Adventure and Environmental Awareness Conference, 1984). In a sense this conference was born out of negativity since the environmental degradation it sought to address (eg footpath erosion, litter, crowded activity sites) was already at an advanced stage. It had taken this level of degradation to motivate the organisers. However, one particular conference delegate stands out precisely because his contribution is not reactive but forward thinking. Loynes (1984: 17) likens much outdoor education practice to an 'express train' where groups are racing through the countryside without thought of the landscape through which they pass. Instead he offers a model whereby the experience is slowed down and individuals encouraged to seek a 'spiritual' connection with the land. In this way, he argues, responsibility towards the environment would result from such experiences and 'that alone could be a major step forward in how we treated (these places)' (Loynes, 1984: 19). In this respect Loynes follows Mortlock (1984) in leading a tentative discussion into the relationship between human beings and the non-human world.

In summary, the 1980s represented a decade of metamorphosis for outdoor education leading AHOEC to claim that 'the nature of outdoor education has changed' (AHOEC, 1988: 10). Mortlock (1984) and Loynes (1984) have restated Drasdo's (1973) neglected position that educational aims are not restricted to personal and social development. In so doing they advanced the claim that the relationship between human beings and the non-human world is one in which outdoor educators have a pedagogic role. This is deemed possible through outdoor educators approaching the environment in a more sensitive manner and achieving their aims by slowing down the processes in which they were involved.

AHOEC (1988) acknowledge that the decade was characterised by a growth and variety of educational experiences. These changes have been brought about largely by 'the rapid pace of economic and social change, and above all the attempt to justify all new initiatives on the basis of cost-effectiveness' (Hopkins and Putnam, 1993: 59). These comments may also serve as a reminder that despite efforts within outdoor education to develop philosophical principles, external forces had a greater influence in strategic direction. It was within this context of financial stringency coupled with the government of the day's ideological commitment to redefining the role of the State in funding public services that led to the first cuts in Strathclyde's staffed centres (Halls, 1997a and 1997b). These socio-economic factors in conjunction with the recognition

that outdoor education exists without statutory status provides a clear indication of the frailty of local authority provision of residential outdoor education in Scotland.

1990s: A Nest of Vipers

In 1993 the Scottish Office Education Department published national guidelines for curriculum and assessment in Scotland. These offered, and still offer, a curricular endorsement that outdoor education has a role to play in the education of primary and early secondary pupils. There is a statement that 'outdoor education can provide an invaluable means of delivering all the outcomes of personal and social development. In particular residential experience, with its different rules and conventions, provides excellent contexts for developing skills' (SOED, 1993c: 24). Within the *Expressive Arts* document outdoor education is noted as one context in which pupils may achieve certain outcomes namely: 'using skills...expressing feelings, ideas, thoughts and solutions' (SOED, 1993b: 64-69).

However it is financial rather than curricular issues which dominate and link the 1980s with the 1990s. A research report commissioned in Wales found that 'as a consequence of financial pressures, many centres, including local authority centres, are seeking to diversify their activities in order to generate more income and to minimise their reliance on a single source of income' (Allison and Taylor, 1995: vi). Scottish local authorities also experienced financial burdens leading to a general series of cuts in education department budgets which, in Strathclyde's case, led to the closure of outdoor centres (Halls, 1997b). Referring to the future of residential outdoor education, Williams (1994) concludes, on the one hand they could become self-financing organisations subject to the demands of the marketplace, or on the other hand they will close down.

Local authority funding of residential outdoor education took on a new dimension with the introduction in 1991 and 1992 of Devolved Management of Resources (DMR) also known as Devolved School Management (DSM) (Scottish Environmental Education Council, 1996). This system devolved responsibility for the management of budgets and spending from education departments to the heads of residential outdoor centres and heads of schools though some issues such as building capital, maintenance and employee costs remain at departmental level (Fowler, 2000). This allowed centres greater autonomy in the spending of individual budgets; and allowed schools, on an individual basis, to decide whether or not they wanted to use the centre and then, whether or not they wanted to subsidise residential visits for their own pupils. Whereas previously, departments would allocate school provision centrally, schools were now free to decide for themselves. Following the introduction of DMR, evidence of the distribution of devolved responsibility versus central control from one authority

to another does not exist. However, where DMR is in operation, outdoor centres are more accountable for their own trading. This had the effect, in Halls' experience at Strathclyde, where 'for the first time, all bed night statistics and expenditure and income of each establishment could be monitored' (Halls, 1997b: 27).

Within this context of financial imperatives the concept of 'the customer' enters the vocabulary of centre staff with schools, pupils, visiting teachers and non-educational bookings coming under the term. Conforming to the market place has created new demands on centre managers. A report by the Scottish Environmental Education Council (1996: 1) stated that 'remaining outdoor education centres face reduced subsidies and the need to recover a higher proportion of their costs from clients'. This meant centre principals became financial managers in addition to their educational role.

Notwithstanding existing financial imperatives, the reorganisation of Scottish local authorities in April 1996 inflicted the greatest loss on residential outdoor education centres since their establishment in the 1960s and 1970s. Whereas nine regional authorities had administered local government prior to reorganisation 32 single tier authorities replaced them. Consequently, these smaller councils are funded proportionally by central government in keeping with their reduced geographical remit. In the process of prioritising services therefore some of the smaller authorities decided that they could not afford the running of residential outdoor centres and consequently closed them. Prior to reorganisation the Scottish Advisory Panel of Outdoor Education indicated that fifteen staffed, local authority residential outdoor education centres were being run by the regions (Scottish Environmental Education Council, 1996). A study conducted after reorganisation found nine remaining (Nicol, 1999).

The Poor Relation

Throughout the 1990s there was a general trend within published literature to favour Mortlock's (1984) term 'adventure education' over 'outdoor education'. Subsequent texts maintained the 'adventure' nomenclature with the publication, in 1993, of *Personal Growth Through Adventure* (Hopkins and Putnam, 1993). Hunt (1989) added the term 'outdoor adventure' which although published in the late 1980s was to have a significant effect in the 1990s. For example, this term was adopted in a subsequent publication *Why Adventure?* (Barrett and Greenaway, 1995). This is a key finding because when the texts refer to 'adventure education' they are talking of learning outcomes related to self-esteem, self-concept and interpersonal relations.

Consequently, a review of outdoor education and adventure education literature shows that when authors write of adventure education there is more of a concern with the personal and social aspect than the environmental. For example, from 263 pages of

text Hunt's (1989) treatment of environmental education is limited to 13. Hopkins and Putnam (1993) do not address environmental education at all in their contents list and there is only very rare, and then brief, descriptive references. A count of the pages of Barrett and Greenaway's (1995) review of research shows that 6 of 54 are given over to research related to the environment generally whilst the remainder of the substantive content focusses on areas of personal and social development. At this point it is not clear in these instances whether the focus presented represents the authors' particular interests or whether the presentation of research relating to the environment is indeed proportional to what exists in practice. This is a significant finding from the literature review and forms the basis of my research enquiry. It is a point noted by Cooper (1991: 10) who states 'the potential for encouraging environmental education through programmes at (outdoor centres) is enormous and yet their influence on raising awareness has been limited'.

It wasn't until the end of the 1990s that a book was written where the author's intention was directed explicitly towards environmental education (Cooper, 1998). Even so this is a guidebook for leaders and not a philosophical treatment. That environmental education is subordinated to personal and social development becomes more apparent when considering a research report which suggests that 'as a consequence of many different economic and political pressures facing the management and staff of public, private and voluntary sector outdoor centres, environmental issues are often not considered a priority within the centre programme' (Allison and Taylor, 1995: vii). Additionally, Cheesmond (1999: 1) claims 'in most local authority centres fostering environmental understanding has always been marginal with the emphasis being on the activity, self and group'. The lack of texts and empirical research relating to environmental education within outdoor education represents a gap in the literature to which I am drawn in this thesis. I am concerned with finding out if the lack of writing on the subject reflects current practice.

Summary

Although the structure and definition within which outdoor education takes place has changed over the period 1950 - 1999, contemporary writers remain convinced that the roots are intact. For example, Hopkins and Putnam (1993: 3) state that 'the aims identified by the Dartington conference are, we believe, the vital aspirations for adventure education'. Likewise, Higgins and Loynes (1997) see outdoor education arising out of personal and social development, environmental education and outdoor activities mirroring the Dartington conferences concern with self, others and the environment (DES, 1975).

However, the debate over definitions has been at the expense of other areas of enquiry.

Firstly, I have already pointed to the lack of a philosophical underpinning; second, there are indications that of the three indicative areas less concern is given to environmental education; third, there is the ever present threat of closure and cuts for local authority residential centres; and lastly, there is a frank admission from Hopkins and Putnam (1993) that the effectiveness of outdoor education is unclear. It is for reasons such as these that Beedie (1996: 13) calls for,

a complete re-appraisal of the claims made for outdoor education from a contemporary socio-cultural perspective...In particular, on the question of definitions, for example, it is not enough for practitioners to understand the subtle differences between outdoor pursuits and outdoor education if other teachers and the public do not. The question of historical antecedents again needs clarification. There is no doubt that without our imperial origins the whole momentum of outdoor education might never have evolved as it did. What is certain, however, is that the socio-cultural context of that era has passed and outdoor educationalists need to understand our present position.

The point here is that whether the favoured terminology is outdoor education or adventure education it doesn't have to be the way it is simply because of historical precedent. It could instead be strategically guided with an eye to government policy, through strategic mechanisms which take account of philosophical and sociological issues.

It has been my intention from the outset of this chapter to dispute McDonald's (1997: 377) claim that 'we don't need independent research to prove the value of outdoor education; we believe in it'. By presenting the historical emergence of appropriate themes I have endeavoured to show, through secondary sources, that outdoor education was never a single homogeneous entity. Instead it developed out of diffuse roots, was modified by statutory, ideological, practical and financial influences and is an arena within which competing and contrasting claims are made of it by an equally divergent range of practitioners and researchers. From this standpoint there is no such thing as 'it'. In order to understand outdoor education, there is a need to disentangle the philosophies which underpin it, its content, the methods adopted by its practitioners and their objectives.

McDonald (1997) may be accurate in his assertion but he does not present a philosophical, or contemporary socio-cultural perspective to support his views. These views from the past may well be accurate and have contemporary relevance. However, if they are accurate it is by accident rather than design. These insights provide some indication of why research to 'prove' that outdoor education works is destined to fail if its starting point assumes homogeneity. Furthermore, the role of outdoor education has a values component which can only be understood in relation to the social milieu in which it is practised. Within this contemporary setting those various claims and

counter claims must be verified by linking theory to practice in relation to stated social and educational goals. It is from this understanding of outdoor education that the remainder of this thesis will proceed. In Chapter Five I will present empirical data in order to interpret some of these claims. At the same time I will be working towards a point where the claims of outdoor education might better be understood within the contemporary socio-cultural perspective to which Beedie (1996) refers. For the moment Chapter Four deals with the data collection methods used to gather this information.

THE RESEARCH APPROACH

Introduction

In selecting an appropriate research approach I wanted to adopt methods that would allow me to make connections between the historical development of outdoor education, described in Chapter Three, and its contemporary practice. A second aspect was to gather data relating to the flexibility of outdoor education in relation to contemporary practice and the potential for programme diversification. The research settings chosen to explore this were drawn from local authority residential outdoor education centres. Such centres typically offer five day multi-activity courses and view primary schools as their main clients. Centres have a tiered management system with the 'principal' in overall charge. The principal's duties include daily operations, the management of instructors, stores, domestic and catering staff, as well as liaison with local authority department representatives.

Pupils are always accompanied by staff from schools. These would normally be teachers although occasionally parent helpers, or members of the school board will act as additional cover. Centres tend to be geographically distant from the schools. This means a bus journey for the pupils to travel from their school (usually urban) to a rural centre. A typical multi-activity programme at an outdoor centre would involve the pupils arriving at midday on a Monday and participating in an outdoor activity in the afternoon. Tuesday through to Thursday would normally consist of participating in one or more outdoor activities each day. On Friday pupils would do one activity and depart in the afternoon.

Evening programmes are provided for pupils but were not included as part of this research. The reason for this is the management arrangements at centres clearly differentiates day work from evening work. Instructors who work with the group through the day go home at night severing the link between what happens in the day to what happens at night. The pilot evidence (Chapter Five) indicated that evening activities were 'time fillers' used to keep the children amused or active. Such activities tend to range from outdoor games (e.g. night lines) to indoor games (e.g. board games, discos, table tennis). The responsibility in the evenings and the variety of activities combine to present a complicated set of variables which I believed would detract from the overall aim of the study. This decision was justified by further evidence which showed that there was no systematic attempt anywhere to integrate the evening activities with the aims of the daytime. In some centres there were no centre staff on duty at all leaving the visiting school teachers with overall responsibility, whilst in others the

centre will provide a duty instructor.

Since I was residentially based during this part of the fieldwork I used the 'spare' time for interviews with visiting teachers, informal chats and observations. Staying residentially allowed me the opportunity to build up trust with those involved. This is in keeping with Taylor and Bogdan's (1998: 45) view that 'observers try to put people at ease, dispelling notions of obtrusive research approaches; establishing their identities as 'OK' persons...'. This was a necessary, albeit labour intensive process, particularly since my intention was to explore beyond everyday actions to understand the values embodied in organisational ethos and the main actors involved in the construction and maintenance of those values. This process of becoming familiar with the area of inquiry, or research setting, is known by Maykut and Morehouse (1994: 25-27) as 'indwelling'.

The process of 'indwelling' presents the researcher with certain decisions to make. For example Taylor and Bogdan (1998) warn that taking notes in the field can be off-putting for the subjects who can become curious about the research which can in turn alter the behaviour that the researcher is trying to understand. This presented me with certain difficulties. The first being that I would be out-of-doors in wet weather sometimes for a whole day without access to any note taking or recording opportunities. The difficulties in remembering complicated sequences of events (both casual conversations and observations) I believed to be beyond my memory recall. To overcome this I compromised by taking notes in a waterproof notebook and talking into a dictaphone.

This compromise was not as intrusive as I had at first thought. The main reason for this was that it was the instructors and not the pupils who were the source of my inquiry. The only reason I did not want the pupils to see me recording data was that I feared it might interfere with what the instructors were trying to achieve. As far as the instructors were concerned they knew in advance that they were under observation and that I would be talking to them after the activity. I told them simply that I was interested in their work, would like to spend a day with them and then talk to them afterwards. The visiting teachers who accompanied the group were briefed in a similar manner and so all the adults knew that I was there for research purposes. I endeavoured to minimise my effect on the group interaction by posing as another instructor. My bulky outdoor waterproof clothes easily concealed the notebook and dictaphone from the pupils. Additionally, whenever I needed to record something it was easy enough to fall behind, hide behind a tree or boulder (if writing in the waterproof notebook), or use the wind to carry my voice away (if using the dictaphone).

The process of 'indwelling' was facilitated in two other ways. I had circulated a questionnaire to all centres in Scotland some time before deciding on the sample selection (Nicol, 1999). All of the centres I subsequently used had responded to this which I took as a sign of some interest in the research. In addition, by following up those centres which did not respond to the questionnaire I began to build up a picture of sites I deemed unlikely to co-operate. I used this as part of the criteria for site selection and so the centres had some familiarity with me as a researcher before I arrived. The second technique I used was to contact the principals in advance of my visit (by telephone and then by letter) to explain the general nature of my research. I explained how I would select my sample and asked the principal to seek the individual instructor's permission for me to observe and interview. I wanted assurance that everyone was happy with this arrangement in advance of the field-work. This procedure worked well. All of the instructors who met the sample criteria agreed to participate.

Sampling

Maykut and Morehouse (1994: 57) suggest it is not the goal of qualitative researchers to build random samples, 'but rather to select persons or settings that we think represent the range of experience on the phenomenon in which we are interested'. The deliberate nature of this form of sampling has been called 'purposive' sampling (Strauss and Corbin, 1990: 183). The deliberations that I considered were firstly national boundaries. With the introduction of a Scottish Parliament in 1999 I wanted to establish the boundary of the study by limiting it within the influence of the new parliamentary constituency. Since education is a devolved responsibility, the funding and future of outdoor education lies with the Scottish Parliament. At the same time Scotland has a curriculum which is distinct from the rest of the United Kingdom rendering it a coherent political and geographical researchable unit.

To assist with the sampling procedure I conducted a short questionnaire survey of all local authority residential centres in Scotland (Nicol, 1999). The findings showed that there were ten such facilities. Two of these were eliminated because their residential accommodation was based in hostels which means the operations did not come under the direct control of the authority. It may seem strange, when I have already pointed out that the residential aspect is not a feature of this research, that I now use it as a criteria for eliminating other sites. However, the issue of who controls the various aspects of the centre's operations is central to answering the research questions. Consequently, I selected sites which tended towards greater autonomy which is the case when the pupils are resident in the centre that is running the programme. The extent to which sustainable living can be achieved within organisations with disparate locations, functions and power differentials is an important if not central issue, but it is, however, beyond the scope of this thesis.

Another important sampling issue resulted from the evidence in Chapter Three which suggests that centres have been affected by changed funding strategies of local authority departments. Of the remaining eight I chose four centres starting with one that might be considered to be 'safe'. It belongs to a local authority whose geographical boundaries remain unchanged through the 1975 and 1996 reorganisations of local government. Given its unchanged boundaries this local authority is arguably the most stable in Scotland. However, this stability should only be seen in comparison to the changing funding priorities in 'downsized' local authorities following disaggregation, particularly in relation to marginal areas such as outdoor education.

I then selected one centre whose existence has been 'threatened' by the possibility of changing its present existence to that of Trust status. This then left the selection of one centre who had gone through this process and is now incorporated as a limited company with Trust status. The selection of my fourth centre was based on the fact that I had worked there. By using this site I was guarding against 'misunderstanding due to unfamiliarity with the culture and language employed' (May, 1997: 141). Whilst using this familiarity to gain access to the organisation I was aware of what are known as 'researcher effects' (Miles and Huberman, 1994). The primary means employed to guard against this was to adopt a multi-method approach to triangulate observations and interviews. In this manner I could explore respondents' perspectives on the basis of what I had seen as opposed to what they thought I knew. Following Miles and Huberman's advice I kept my research questions in mind and noted deviant cases. Throughout the interviews I was also prepared with primer questions to be asked if I felt that an assumption of common knowledge was masking the line of enquiry.

I used this site as a pilot centre trying out all of the interview and observational techniques, in all of the stages of research, before moving on to the other settings. All of the latter three have been affected by the disaggregation of Regions in Scotland (1996) and now belong to smaller funding authorities than before. There is also a geographical spread representing the most densely populated urban areas in Scotland. The reason for this was to identify the differences, if any, in the way in which individual authorities viewed outdoor education in relation to policy objectives.

At the same time I did not want to exclude potential sources of valuable data from outside the boundaries I had imposed. One centre stands out in this respect. It is based in England and is well known for the work in which I am interested. This is evident in the frequency with which articles from the centre principal are found in professional journals. I chose to include this site on the basis of what Miles and Huberman (1994: 28) call 'reputational case selection'. Whilst the scope of the study remains particular to Scotland it was intriguing to find a centre espousing views consistent with sustainable living. The selection of this site was based on its reputation

as an example of 'best practice'.

The total site sample amounted to five establishments. At this stage I had little idea if the sites I had chosen would be sufficient to answer my research questions. This raised the issue of sample size or, in other words, what constituted an appropriate number of research sites? Would five sites be sufficient? In this I was guided by the concept of saturation. Saturation occurs 'when we reach the point of diminishing returns from our data collection efforts, (at this point) we can be reasonably assured that we have conducted a thorough study' (Maykut and Morehouse, 1994: 62). More simply, saturation occurs when your data stops telling you anything new. Whilst tentatively proposing five sites at the outset I was prepared to follow Silverman's (2000) advice to add more sites, or increase the sample size within each site, until the point of saturation was reached.

Research Design

This is an emergent design which means 'that data collection and data analysis are simultaneous and ongoing activities which allow for important understandings to be discovered along the way and then pursued in additional collection efforts' (Maykut and Morehouse, 1994: 174). This meant that further sampling took place when deciding the relevant sources within each centre. Consequently sampling should be thought of in two stages. The first being the selection of the sites and the second being the sample from *within* each site. This latter aspect is explained during the course of the research as each data gathering layer unfolds. This is in keeping with Mason's (1996) view that the researcher works with their analysis, theory and sampling activities interactively *during* the research process.

Before the data unfolds it may be of value to summarise the actual data gathering sequence that took place. In choosing an emergent approach I wanted to allow discoveries along the way. This decision was vindicated as I had originally intended using the five centres to develop a framework to understand sustainable living and then select one of these centres as an in-depth case study. What I envisioned was developing and then implementing a programme for sustainable living and evaluating it in terms of the pupils' learning. However I had not accounted for the importance instructors attached to the testimony of visiting teachers and the consequences this would have for my research questions. Nor did I anticipate fully the powerful value orientations deeply embedded in centres' organisational ethos which operates at the expense of diversity of programmes. Both of these issues were highlighted in the pilot study (discussed more fully in Chapter Five) and altered the direction of the research.

The research design as it actually happened consisted of a five stage process. Stage one involved semi-structured interviews with two instructors at each centre. These took

place during and following an activity session which I had observed. During the activity I was interested in the relationship between activities and aims. A second purpose was to identify the extent to which this process is the product of planning. A third was to identify the range of teaching styles employed by the instructor (whether differentiated, varied, flexible). The fourth purpose was to discover the modes of engagement (physical, cognitive and affective) employed by the instructor.

By using observations and interview methods I sought to improve the validity of my data through triangulation. For Silverman (2000: 91) 'the issue of validity is usually posed in terms of what constitutes a credible claim to truth' whereas triangulation is described as 'a research strategy that involves using several methods to reveal multiple aspects of a single empirical reality' (Silverman 1997: 25). More simply triangulation allows the study of human behaviour from more than one standpoint as a means of improving validity (Cohen and Manion, 1994). The validity that I was trying to establish is the correspondence between what instructors say they do (through interviews) and what they actually do (through observations).

However, the validity I seek through the triangulation of methods is not simply to arrive at a single understanding. As Mason (1996: 149) warns this would imply 'a view of the social world which says that there is one, objective, and knowable reality, and all that social researchers have to do is to work out which are the most appropriate triangulation points to measure it by...'. In this sense I am interested in the *differences* in social behaviour that the multi-method approach shows up as much as the points of convergence. It is these inconsistencies that I sought out in order to understand aspects of outdoor education. The question of validity therefore does not rest simply with the selection of method. Accepting that reality is multi-faceted (Maykut and Morehouse, 1994) the challenge is to explain why the account that I present is more important than any other account.

One way of achieving this is known as 'validity of interpretation' the essence of which Mason (1996: 150) describes thus:

The basic principle here is that you are never taking it as self-evident that a particular interpretation can be made of your data but instead that you are continually and assiduously charting and justifying the steps through which your interpretations were made. If you do this effectively, it should enable you to show both that you have understood and engaged with your own position, or standpoint, or analytic lens, in a *reflexive* sense, and also that you have tried to read your data from alternative perspectives.

In adopting this approach it is important to consider the appropriate selection of methods to address the research questions whilst simultaneously generating data and

interpreting them. This is a complex process with no inherent validity. What it requires is external verification. In short validity comes from the interaction between the reader and the process I describe. In other words I am asking the reader if this is a credible account. It is therefore the reader who is the ultimate arbiter, a concept referred to by Peräkylä (1997: 208) as 'apparent validity'.

Stage two involved semi-structured interviews with the principal at each centre. I was trying to establish what it is that the principal expects their instructors to do and what is expected of them from the local authority department and from schools.

In stage three I interviewed visiting teachers in keeping with Taylor and Bogdan's (1998: 9) claim that 'the goal of qualitative research is to examine how things look from different vantage points'.

In stage four I returned to interview the principals. Whereas the purpose of the first interview focussed on the general nature of outdoor education, the second interview dealt more specifically with environmental education and sustainability. Given the lack of methodological precedent in this area I devised a specific method for this purpose.

The final stage involved interviews with senior officers within local authorities who had responsibility for outdoor education. As each stage unfolds in the thesis more specific details are given as to the location of interviews, their content and duration.

Throughout stages two, three, four and five I used another form of triangulation to study the research area from multiple standpoints. This is what Taylor and Bogdan (1998: 80) refer to as a 'combination...of sources of data in a single study'. What I was setting out to achieve was the different views that instructors, principals, visiting teachers and local authority officers have on outdoor education. By including this diverse range of respondents I was seeking to avoid anecdotalism where data interpretation depends 'on a few well chosen examples' (Silverman, 2000: 176). Silverman's point is that these examples can be used to provide evidence to support the researcher's contention as opposed to trying to understand the data in their entirety.

To guard against this I have adopted a particular style of data selection, writing and critical analysis. Firstly I am guided by ideas relating to 'theoretical sensitivity'. Strauss and Corbin (1990: 41) state that 'theoretical sensitivity refers to a personal quality of the researcher'. The researcher becomes more sensitive to the research topic through knowledge of its literature, together with professional and personal experience of the research area. Throughout the thesis I claim theoretical sensitivity, firstly in my knowledge of the literature used throughout the thesis. This is deployed in a critical manner but not for the sake of criticism alone. It is used to compose a narrative called

a 'storyline', taking the reader from point to point and beginning to end (Golden-Biddle and Locke, 1997). Additionally, in Chapter One I have claimed theoretical sensitivity through having worked in the field and having a lifetime personal interest in the outdoors. The combination of personal and professional aspects, Strauss and Corbin (1990) argue, creates greater theoretical sensitivity between the researcher and the research. Strauss and Corbin (1990: 43) add that 'the analytic process itself provides an additional source of theoretical sensitivity (since) insight and understanding about a phenomenon increase as you interact with your data'.

This leads directly to the second issue where I follow Mason's (1996) view that qualitative research involves a constant interaction between the ontological (what constitutes the social world) and epistemological (what counts as data and evidence). Thus when I present data as evidence, the claims I make are woven into the analysis. They are framed within the context of what Creswell (1994: 5) refers to as 'the personal voice' where it is I, Robbie Nicol, who is making judgments regarding validity. In all cases I have endeavoured to make a direct and transparent link between me, my methods, the data I generate and the way I analyse them. It is on the basis of this self-interrogation, where meanings and claims are overt, that claims to validity rest. Ultimately, however, it is for you, the reader, to judge whether this process is indeed valid.

THE PILOT STUDY

The purpose of this chapter is to understand what it is that outdoor education instructors mean when they talk about outdoor education. As this is a pilot study the intention is to develop ways of distinguishing between relevant and non relevant data prior to conducting research at the other sites. To assist this process I have developed a series of categories to assist in the ordering and analysis of data. Consequently I introduce three different categories of aim which I have termed 'substantive', 'intended' and 'consequential'. I show how aims relating to environmental education and personal and social development fit into this categorisation. The tension between aims and activities is discussed, as is the power relationships between instructor, centre and school in setting aims. The extent to which aims are being achieved is dealt with through a critique of the way in which instructors deal with the evaluation of pupils' learning outcomes, triangulated by the conscious attempt, on the part of instructors, to implement theoretical principles.

Since I considered much of the data to be sensitive I wanted to protect the identity of each individual and each centre. It is sensitive in the sense that I am asking instructors to be critical of themselves, their peers, as well as the organisation and profession in which they work. Consequently, I am asking them to justify their work where differing points of view offer potential for individual and organisational conflict. Consequently, each instructor has a pseudonym as has each centre. All of the centres in the thesis are named after Scottish mountains (An Teallach, Carn an Fhìdhleir, Ladhar Bheinn, Lochnagar) and the pilot study centre is called Beinn Dearg. The remainder of the centres will be introduced as they appear. The instructors who work at Beinn Dearg are Michael, Chris, Miller, Geraldine, Tim and Paul.

Sampling

This pilot study is drawn from five days of observations at Beinn Dearg, each day with a different instructor and a total of eight hours of taped interviews where every instructor who was observed was also interviewed after the activity. There were six instructors at this centre and I wanted to spend a full day with each. Since this was a five day programme I could not observe all of the instructors. It happened that two instructors were running the same activity programme and so I chose to eliminate one of these. This meant that I could observe all of the activities on offer that week. I stayed residentially at the centre and had the opportunity to talk to duty instructors each evening; this duty being shared by all the instructors on a rotational basis. Consequently, the person I did not manage to observe I could still interview in the

evening. The comments for this particular interview were logged in note form as this instructor did not want to be electronically recorded. In all other cases the interviews took place at the end of the day after activities and I had to warn the respondents that the interviews would extend into their own time. In summary, there are five people who were observed and interviewed and one who was interviewed but not observed.

One of the tasks of the pilot study was to establish a means of sampling instructors at the remaining sites. In light of the pilot, interviews and observations for the remaining four sites were restricted to only two instructors; the instructor with longest service, and the instructor with the shortest service. The reason for this selection arose as a result of reviewing the length of service for each instructor in relation to their initial training. These variables are summarised in the following table:

Table 1: Instructor Training and Length of Service

	Service in years	Training
Instructor 1	1	NGB awards
Instructor 2	5	BA Outdoor Education in the Community (no TQ)
Instructor 3	12	NGB awards
Instructor 4	12	Physical education degree
Instructor 5	18	Postgraduate diploma in outdoor education.
Instructor 6	20	Physical education degree

From the interview data it became apparent that there were variations between lengths of service from one instructor to the next and extremes between the longest serving (20 years) and shortest serving (one year) with the average length of service (11 years) suggesting that there is a low turnover of staff. I wondered whether length of service was a significant variable and whether the activities and processes in which instructors engage on a daily basis depended on their own educational background. As can be seen from Table One the instructors came from different training backgrounds whereby some had completed specific outdoor education undergraduate and postgraduate degree courses, some others had a physical education undergraduate degree and yet others had a background in national governing body awards. In using these for my sample selection criteria I was concerned to see if they were significant in the way that instructors came to conceptualise their work.

Keeping the sample method in mind I wanted to explore the more conceptual aspects of

my study. I have developed a style of analytic narrative based on developing an emergent coding system whilst 'simultaneously allowing readers direct access to raw data' (Silverman, 2000: 186). In this way I am crafting a 'storyline' (Strauss and Corbin, 1990) using the interview responses (the 'raw data') to allow the respondents tell their own story.

Throughout this pilot study the research schedule was guided by the primary research question:

Primary Research Question 1

What is the nature of outdoor education as perceived by the instructors employed within local authority outdoor centres?

In addressing this question I wanted to know how instructors would respond when asked quite simply 'what are your aims?' When talking of aims I am referring to what it is that the instructor intends to achieve in their everyday capacity as an outdoor education instructor. Throughout the pilot I set out to determine the range of aims that instructors work towards throughout a week long multi-activity programme. At this stage I was not looking to record all potential aims so much as to understand the way in which aims were talked about in terms of depth of understanding and clarity of terminology. Before I could record what I expected to be an enormous range of aims I wanted to be prepared with a way of categorising them prior to analysis. This pilot therefore sets out the beginnings of a conceptual framework. As instructors began to itemise their individual aims I was able to develop a themed method of grouping the data.

The instructors were not restricted to those aims associated with outdoor activities but instead to the whole residential experience. Because the research question was aimed at outdoor education in its most general sense I did not want to start imposing any boundaries of my own at this stage. I wanted to capture the data initially in relation to how instructors conceptualise outdoor education. During the interviews I have favoured the use of the word 'aim' instead of 'objectives' or 'outcomes'. This, I believed, would encourage instructors to feel more comfortable talking about the 'grey areas' of overlapping aims without feeling I was asking them to quantify or measure what they were doing. In this I was more concerned with what the instructors were doing in order to achieve their aims rather than focussing on measuring pupil outcomes. The pilot was designed to develop these 'grey areas' into explicit themes.

Aims Stated and Recorded - Substantive

Instructors articulated aims in one of three ways. The first of these is substantive where the aim is articulated in both verbal and written form by the instructor.

'Listening' for example was of such priority with Michael that it is a stated aim for every group. Evidence of such was expressed in two ways. First it was included as part of a group contract which developed out of a 'brainstorming' session and written on a blackboard as 'lets try and listen to everybody'. Michael added, 'I always work to try and ensure that the children come up with that (listening) as one of their goals. I'll lead them into it but they usually do it without much prompting'. He continued, 'I want them to realise during the week that one of the skills to take back to school is a listening skill and because of the immediacy, if they don't listen, they don't learn...'. In a similar manner both Tim's group and Michael's group contract included 'having fun' (these contracts were negotiated between the instructor and their group on the first day). Aims of this sort are 'substantive' since they are not only articulated in verbal and written form but they also lend themselves well to evaluation where the consequences of not listening are readily observable. Michael explained that if they do not listen 'they might end up getting wet...they're not going to hurt themselves but they realise it is worthwhile to listen'.

Aims Stated but not Recorded - Intended

In addition to substantive aims instructors talk about favourable processes through which they believe learning is most likely to take place. I have called these 'intended' because they lack the pithy content of substantive aims yet display a certain universality easily found amongst the staff at Beinn Dearg. These take the form of aims which are stated but not necessarily recorded. For example Chris hoped that 'by the end of a week the group will listen to what each other is saying, listen to each other and not just to the instructors...'. This differed from Michael's in that whereas Michael recorded and stated 'listening' as an aim Chris stated but did not support the aim in written form for the pupils to see. Within this category terms are found such as achievement, fun, enjoyment and new experiences.

They are also intended because they are conceptually vague. For example, 'achievement' is more the statement of a general principle than expression of focus and, I would suggest, remains a principle until there is a context and outcome. Talking of outdoor education in a general sense Tim stated '...it is adventurous. It's quite challenging and quite daunting to some people...That takes a great deal of courage as mentioned. It's the same with the ropes course, even mountain biking. It's all quite challenging and it's a great achievement for them...'. The references to 'achievement', 'adventure', 'daunting', 'courage' and 'challenge' do not stand alone. Used in this sense it is difficult to recognise what the achievement is. It is more of a series of activities which lack specific conceptual grounding.

However, the meaning becomes more apparent when considering examples of what

instructors considered to be achievements. Michael suggested 'for some of them (pupils), just being outside is an achievement. For others, being able to help or accept help from each other is an achievement'. Michael supplied a further example suggesting 'it might be a child (only) swearing ten times a day instead of twenty times a day, that can be an achievement as long as they felt it was an achievement'. Similarly Chris suggested that an achievement would be when 'they can do an activity and gain new experience without it breaking down into squabbles and fights...'. Achievement in this instance is therefore determined by the absence of certain behaviour rather than a behavioural presence (i.e. not behaving 'badly' as opposed to 'good' behaviour). Similarly, Paul commented that 'rewards tend to be on the hill when we've achieved something, we've kept together, no-one has felt left out'. In all these examples a judgment is being made on the part of the instructor ranging from determining what is tolerable behaviour to assessing the psychological states of pupils. These are fascinating insights since they begin to show what it is that instructors mean when they talk of personal and social education.

'Fun' is recognised as an important element of instructor discourse. By the end of a one week programme Tim would expect the group to have 'had a great deal of fun'. Talking of aims generally Michael suggested 'it's physical work but it has to be a lot of fun so they come back happy, they've enjoyed it and they've built up a rapport'. In observing this session the fun element throughout the afternoon was evident where expressions of laughter and engagement in the activity were apparent. The activity in question involved four files of children having to run into a depression in the ground (it looked like a bomb crater) from different angles and run up the other side without colliding with one another. I recorded in my notebook as a research note 'lots of fun at the crater'. Similarly Chris expressed a hope that 'by the end of the week they've had fun'. These views were endorsed by Geraldine who said that all the activities 'had to be fun'. However, Paul warned that 'we've got to somehow say this isn't a holiday but face up to the fact that we (the pupils) are now doing something differently or behaving differently to what we were when we came in...We didn't just have a good time...'.

Like fun, 'enjoyment' and 'pleasure' are referred to as important to the instructors at Beinn Dearg. Michael argued that because outdoor education instructors 'have time to listen to them and time to talk *with* them rather than talk *at* them, maybe they can see what a pleasant experience that is and follow it on and realise that this may be a way to behave themselves because they find it pleasurable'. I witnessed the immediacy of such pleasure whilst accompanying Chris on a hill walk. Taking shelter in a Zarsky sack (a lightweight group shelter carried for safety reasons by instructors and capable of protecting up to twelve people) Chris conducted an interim review where pupils were

encouraged to express their feelings and how the day was going for them. I recorded in my notebook as a research note that 'the whole group expressed their enjoyment of the day even though they have had to work hard walking up the hill. Everybody said they would do it (the hillwalk) again'.

However, enjoyment is sometimes a difficult concept to pin down as it is riddled with perceptual differences. For example, I observed an abseil where one very nervous pupil took a lot of coaxing from the instructor before completing the task. I asked the instructor about the incident and he felt that on the whole the pupil had enjoyed the experience. On the other hand I thought the pupil had not enjoyed it since my memory of the incident was one of someone in tears, humbled in front of peers who were shouting noisily about how easy it was. I don't want to say that the instructor was wrong and I was right, the truth is neither of us really knew if the pupil enjoyed it. No review or debrief of the incident had taken place and Tim's view was based on the perception that in overcoming fear the pupil must inevitably arrive at a position of enjoyment. This incident is testament to the difficulty of assessing what is going on when concepts such as fun and enjoyment are the guiding principles.

'New experiences' appear as a significant aim with Michael suggesting that 'for many of the children we work with it's an alien environment so it's something new and it's an adventure'. This included 'touching animals that they have never touched before'. Similarly there is the view that 'everything's so different for them, they're away from their home environment...I suppose it's a fresh start for them...building relationships (the residential) with us I think' (Chris). Or in the same vein 'part of the adventure is the unknown, things they have never experienced, certain barriers, certain activities...' (Chris). Tim concurred suggesting that 'they can come out and experience canoeing, abseiling and the outdoor things we're giving them that, they've never had a chance to do it before'. What is happening here is that new experiences are being linked to an activity. This was more apparent in Miller's statement that 'something like the hill walking I see that as opening up a whole new sport to folks, the chances are that they haven't done anything like that before'. It is worth noting that the claim that pupils gain new experiences at outdoor centres is based on perception and not empirical evaluation. This is to say instructors have no coherent way of knowing the history of pupils' experiences. If instructors are using this as part of an educational rationale for outdoor education provision then some empirical work would be welcome in establishing the facts.

Aims - Consequential

There are other aims not necessarily associated with outdoor education but are of sufficient importance that instructors felt the need to mention them. These arise as a

consequence of pupils living residentially and having to fend for themselves, or occur incidentally in the process of engaging in activities. This lead Tim to suggest that pupils being able to dress themselves for activities in a self-disciplined manner is an achievement. On the same theme Paul suggested that some weeks individual achievements can be no more than pupils being able to 'tie their shoe lace'. Paul also believed that coming to the centre for some pupils means 'having a bed of their own'. Visiting a residential outdoor centre also gives pupils the opportunity to understand their own country. This point was made by Geraldine who suggested that 'some people had been to Disneyland and that they didn't even know their own back yard'.

Whereas aims relating to personal and social development may be found throughout the substantive, intended and consequential framework, this is not the case with environmental education. At this point it is important to distinguish between activities which are used specifically for environmental education and those which are not. Activities used at Beinn Dearg with specific focus on environmental education are seashore studies and pond-dipping. For outdoor activities with a non-specific environmental education focus aims are achieved as an adjunct to the activity in the same way that personal and social development aims are seen as instrumental. I would like to categorise pond-dipping and seashore studies as belonging to 'field studies' after Cooper (1991) who sees these types of activity as closely related to the school curriculum particularly subjects such as biology, geography and geology. As such they are commonly regarded as 'traditional', relying on a prescriptive methodology drawn largely from a scientific understanding of the world (Cooper, 1991).

Countryside Code

However, the ease of categorisation where environmental education is an adjunct of an outdoor activity is not so straightforward. When I asked instructors to comment on the relationship between activities and environmental education all six took the view that it was about respecting the environment and how people should behave in it. Instructors want pupils to take care of the environment so the pupils are told not to drop litter, to shut gates and not climb them, not to disturb farm animals and, in some cases, to be quiet. These are all rules and they relate to what is commonly known as 'The Countryside Code'. Instructors also adopt a personal ethic such as not using trees as anchor points for abseiling and being sensitive in route choice to avoid path erosion. When environmental aspects are viewed in this manner instructors claim that *all* activities involved environmental education. Implicit in this position is the belief that environmental education is 'happening' because both instructors and pupils are seen to be following guidelines relating to environmental sensitivity.

Countryside Interpretation

In addition to the Countryside Code instructors like to identify and name features. In this manner trees become birch, alder and fir, animals become red deer, robins and buzzards, landforms become glacial trenches and v-shaped riverbeds. Relationships are sometimes discussed where it is pointed out that fir trees planted close together have no needles at their bases because they shield each other from the sun's energy.

Instructors will sometimes take time out from the outdoor activity to discuss natural cycles, the easiest identifiable being the water cycle. These relationships are sometimes interpreted with regard to human involvement such as straths dammed for hydro-schemes, or the economic importance of forestry. Sometimes the more negative aspects of human involvement with the landscape are pointed out. I would like to categorise this approach as 'countryside interpretation'. It is to be distinguished from the Countryside Code since it extends beyond rules and guidelines focusing instead on the social and natural history of the countryside through which pupils pass.

However, both of these remain a very narrowly focussed view of environmental education. They are constrained by two factors and the first is that interpretation does not extend beyond the descriptive which means that the instructor is simply passing on information. This should be distinguished from pupils *interacting* with this knowledge which is a requirement of Reason's (1998) four point epistemology. For example during one observation we came across foresters felling trees and I noted in my field-work diary,

this offered a great opportunity to introduce local economy, planting policy, biodiversity etc etc - not taken up. One of the foresters was also the deer stalker who had portions of culled deer in a vehicle. This could easily have led to discussions about where food comes from, deer population leading to impoverished biodiversity etc.

My intention here is not to adopt a position of lofty superiority imposing my own preferences upon what I otherwise noted to be a very successful day in terms of personal and social development. It is more to establish the weighting and focus that instructors give to environmental education when faced with the competing demands of getting to the top of a hill (the activity that day) whilst meeting personal and social aims.

In such activity days (I observed three hill walks during the pilot study) this becomes manifest in the deterministic view that getting to the top of the hill is important where the instructors believe that the pupils would feel they were underachieving if not, and that would be contrary to the self-esteem aspect of personal and social development. It is deterministic because instructors are prioritising what is important and these priorities are manifest in what are considered by instructors to be achievements. Outcomes, in this instance, therefore are perceived to arise out of getting to the top of a

hill as opposed to *being* on the hill.

Given these priorities it is extremely difficult for instructors to go beyond the rules orientation of the Countryside Code or to spend the time going beyond descriptive engagement in countryside interpretation. It would be violating the parameters of what they consider to be legitimate learning outcomes. As such instructors are imposing a set of values on pupils. What is absent is the pupils being asked to consider why these values exist or why they are important. This brings me to the second limitation of the countryside interpretation approach which is that it is essentially cognitive based.

For Drasdo (1973) and Mortlock (1984) the human condition extends to the *affective* domain which they interpret as synonymous with both 'emotions' and 'feelings'. Inherent in this position is that there are different ways of knowing and so one can have a rational understanding of the environment such as knowing the names of trees, or one can have an affective understanding such as experiencing a feeling of wonder or awe. That this form of knowing is absent from normal practice is confirmed in Paul's attempt to introduce activities 'where people had a quiet place, but (he had) not received a lot of (organisational) support'. The use of 'quiet places' is a recognised method of encouraging affective responses to the environment (Cornell, 1979). The absence of such opportunities becomes all the more apparent when examples of 'good' practice appear. These two examples show that instructors *can* operate beyond the descriptive and engage ways of knowing beyond the cognitive domain. During one observation Chris told me:

one of the children saw the oil (industrial storage) tanks and said that 'they (site workers) had to be very careful the oil doesn't leak into the water', I mentioned something about it getting into the food chain. I suppose in the bigger environmental picture, you...get children to start thinking about cause and effect..., thinking about weeds leading to something else, or polluting the water might lead to other things (such as) how oil spills affect shellfish.

In this example Chris was moving beyond the descriptive. This is an example of something which interested a pupil and the focus created a direct link between the pupil, the instructor and the issue. It was not simply the imparting of information. The instructor then takes the issue beyond the specific context and, by asking them to consider consequences, shares the responsibility of learning with the pupils. Chris also provided a second example which indicates how environmental education can reach beyond the cognitive domain. In this instance he had the pupils stand on top of a hill with their eyes closed concentrating on hearing and breathing. It is these types of activities that Cooper (1999) suggests awakens the senses and engenders the feeling of connection with nature.

Environmental education at Beinn Dearg does not have a high profile. What is presented as environmental education is done in the form of rules (the Countryside Code) or in descriptive terms (countryside interpretation). Comments from Michael ('when we're there we see things') and the principal ('it happens more through the fact that we do it anyway than it's actually planned') indicate that there is not a coherent or rational approach to the delivery of environmental aspects. For these reasons environmental education cannot be seen as a substantive aim but somewhere between intended and consequential.

As I indicated in Chapter Three, secondary sources within outdoor education do not allow a more comprehensive critique of environmental education. This is a limitation which does not reflect the developing profile of environmental education outside the field of outdoor education where the nature, content and aims are being re-considered and expanded (Orr, 1993; Smyth, 1995 and 1999; Hart, *et al.*, 1999). It is clear that these developments, as discussed in Chapter One, have not filtered through to Beinn Dearg.

In summary aims can be substantive, intended or consequential. Where they are substantive they are both orally and textually explicit in the way they are communicated from instructor to pupil. Where they are intended they are less tangible but their reliability derives from the regularity with which instructors cite them as aims. Consequential aims are evident where, as a result of participating in either activities or living residentially, pupils encounter situations not necessarily planned for nor intended by the instructor.

From the range of aims espoused by instructors it becomes apparent there is a clear expression of diversity. Much of what I have described as 'consequential aims' bear no direct relation to the activities that the pupils undertake throughout an outdoor education programme. I have therefore arrived at the position where I can more specifically address the following secondary research question.

Secondary Research Question 1a:

Are activities used for their own sake or to achieve some other goal?

This is not the first time this question has been raised within the theory and research of outdoor education (Greenaway, 1990; Nicol and Higgins, 1998). The reason for raising it here is the assumption, on my part, that the debate has not been resolved. Nor is there a satisfactory conceptual framework in which it could be interpreted. Take for example the responses from Chris during an interview regarding the value of physical outdoor activities: 'if you take some of the gorge walking sort of things that outdoor centres now do with helmets and wetsuits, throwing themselves into rock pools and

sliding down, that's just recreation. They're using the outdoors purely for their own enjoyment and pleasure.' When I asked 'do you agree or disagree with that?' Chris responded 'I don't mind I've got no objection to folk (other centres) doing that'.

This returns to the Chapter Three discussion on whether outdoor activities in themselves are intrinsically valuable, whether they are used to achieve some other goal, or a combination of both. Barrett and Greenaway (1995: 5) have developed a model showing the ingredients and relationship between activities, recreation and education.

Table 2: Programme Model

PROGRAMME STYLE	RECREATIONAL	EDUCATIONAL
ADVENTURE	anything new	support to take risks and overcome fears
OBJECTIVES	assumed "It's good for them"	explicit possibly negotiable
ACTIVE LEARNING PROCESS	"Let the experience speak for itself"	encouragement to review experience

They suggest that where the activity (the pupils experience of it) is left so that 'the experience speaks for itself', then this would suggest that aims are recreational. When this is the case the activity itself becomes the aim which is therefore recreational. Experiences arising out of doing the activities, Barrett and Greenaway (1995) assert, become more educational when the experiences are subject to review. This promotes the view that if outdoor activities are to be considered educational then there is a degree of emphasis placed on the role of the instructor to interpret those experiences in a way that draws out more than the recreational aspect of participating in the activity.

The abseil incident described above provides an excellent example to test the cohesiveness of this framework. Because the experience was left to 'speak for itself' and not reviewed this would lead to the conclusion that it was more recreational than educational. However, Barrett and Greenaway's (1995: 5) framework also shows that something is more educational than recreational when the pupil is given 'support to take risks and overcome fears'. My observations of this incident show that the instructor believed that the pupil received plenty of support from himself and peers alike. This raises the question of whether such 'support' instils confidence in the pupil or acts as a form of intimidation. It would appear therefore that there are matters of degree and that fixed categories are difficult to maintain. However, this system does suggest that despite the pupil overcoming the risks and fears, the situation could have

been more educational if that experience had been reviewed.

This point is further illustrated when juxtaposed with another example whereby the instructor was clearly operating within the educational domain. I included a note from my fieldwork diary which occurred on a 400m hilltop.

Chris runs a brilliant debrief and general discussion in the Zarsky over lunch (it is heavy rain and cold outside). Includes personal performances on the way up...They talk about physics, that Muslims believe in different things than Christians, have different festivals and special days. One pupil suggested that he hated all Japanese because his favourite wrestler got beaten by a Japanese wrestler which led into a discussion about racism and nationalism (all led by Chris). This was a 30 minute interactive discussion skilfully led and including everybody. It seemed to me that this is what outdoor education is about where you make use of these informal moments to specifically address what is essentially values education.

It is clear that instructors can use activities in an instrumental way in keeping with Barrett and Greenaway's (1995) model. There is though considerable variation in the extent to which instructors operate beyond the recreational. However, as I pointed out in Chapter Three, concentrating on the instrumental versus intrinsic argument avoids the central issue. As Drasdo (1973) and Mortlock (1984) suggested, in their different ways, the key to outdoor education is through phenomenology. Although they did not use the term it unites them both in their different quests to understand experience. If the nature of experience were deemed to be the point of departure then the tensions between recreational and educational, intrinsic and instrumental would cease to exist at the existential level. What this research question highlights is that there are few examples of instructors looking at the nature of experience from the pupils point of view.

Secondary Research Question 1b:

Are some activities better than others in achieving aims?

Higgins and Loynes (1997) see the outdoor activity as part of a complex interaction of components including, in the first instance, outdoor activities, environmental education and personal and social development. This view is supported by all staff at Beinn Dearg. Paul suggested further that neither component is more important but 'at times, one has a greater place than the other' depending upon the group circumstances.

Keighley (1985) made the point that some activities are better than others for achieving aims. Cooper (1997) takes the debate further by suggesting a grading system. For example, abseiling has 'most potential' for achieving self-esteem, confidence and motivation but only 'some potential' for co-operation, trust and empathy' (Cooper, 1997: 26). However, Higgins and Loynes (1997: 7) warn that 'the degree to which

these...are discussed and reviewed to enhance educational outcomes appears to be variable'. From these statements it is possible to suggest that activities should be chosen in accordance with the aims that outdoor educationalists are trying to achieve and not vice versa. If this is the case then my own research shows up anomalies between aims and activities.

For example, instructors were asked 'is there anything done at the centre you would like to see done away with?' Geraldine replied 'biking, it is very technical and if kids can't keep their balance it is very difficult, in a session, to teach them to keep their balance, its not very good for personal and social work, there are too many failures'. Likewise Miller suggested the aims associated with biking were 'nowhere near as clearcut as it would be with most activities'. Paul said that biking tends to be very focussed on the bikes. It's difficult because of the mechanical nature of biking to have that much group work. From that point of view, it's not that useful'. Here then is evidence of an activity which half of the teaching staff find incompatible with the centres overall stated mission which is 'to provide for both personal and social development' (quoted from Beinn Dearg's handbook *Organisers Notes*). Bearing in mind that this was an open ended question the fact that biking came up three times out of six adds weight to this finding.

Another example of the confusion over disparate organisational aims comes from Miller who adopted the use of the word 'sport' when talking of activities. Likewise Chris argued strongly for the recreational aspect on the basis of increasing leisure opportunities for the pupils; 'I would have liked to think that at least hill walking, the activity, was experienced in a positive light because that might be something they might want to take up...'. In view of the fact that some instructors view outdoor activities as sport I must conclude that where instructors take the view that aims are recreational then it does not matter what activity is chosen since the aim is synonymous with the activity. An example of this being the use of bikes as described above. In support of this assertion there are no claims being made of this activity other than that of sport and recreation. The absence of such claims and the absence of any reviewing confirm that biking is a recreational activity which is not in the programme because of any consequential or instrumental aims.

It is possible from these examples to deduce that, in some instances, activities are driving aims as opposed to vice versa. The existence of such diversity amongst instructors is an indication of two points, first that Beinn Dearg does not advocate a universal approach which instructors must adhere to; secondly, in the absence of such a directive instructors have a large degree of autonomy to work on aims of their choice on a daily and weekly basis.

I have also demonstrated that some activities lend themselves better to educational aims whilst some are considered to be more recreational, in keeping with secondary sources (Keighley, 1985; Barrett and Greenaway, 1995; Cooper, 1997; Higgins and Loynes, 1997). Generally speaking, instructors do not see the pursuit of recreational aims in a pejorative sense believing that the activity may well encourage pupils to take up the activity as a sport or leisure pursuit in later life.

This leads to the research question posed earlier, 'are activities used for their own sake or to achieve some other goal?' The data I have presented so far suggests that the answer is both, or in another way, activities are used for both intrinsic and instrumental aims. However, if the practice of outdoor education is to correspond with its claimed aims in relation to personal and social development then activities must be chosen to achieve the aim regardless of its recreational or educational components. Where the activity *is* the aim then the aim is inherent in the activity and verification is established purely through participation. However, this is not personal and social development and should not be confused as such. It cannot be deemed personal and social development because there is no recognition, on the instructors part, of the relationship between teaching objectives and learning outcomes. Without this intention on the part of the instructor, aims are not fully understood nor appropriately catered for. However, where aims are of the substantive type then they are explicit, clearly relate the activity to the aim and are therefore more readily verifiable. Where they are intended and consequential it becomes more difficult to identify the instructors' intentions.

Secondary Research Question 1c:

Who sets the aims?

Whether aims are 'substantive', 'intended' or 'consequential' it is clear that there exists a degree of conceptual diversity within which instructors operate. This leads to the next area of enquiry. I wanted to explore the relative autonomy instructors enjoy (identified in the last research question) in relation to expressions of intent from the centre management and the visiting school. To establish this I had first to determine how the timetabled programme came to be made up.

The principal suggested it is normal procedure for the schools to select from a prescribed range of activity programmes. Whether it is the pupils or the teachers who decide is a matter for each individual school. In this sense the schools have a choice of activities. This insight into programme development suggests that schools choose their programmes on the basis of activities and not aims although the principal and all of the instructors believe that schools want the pupils to be involved in aspects of personal and social development. This is understandable as it fits in with the schools'

requirements to deliver the 5-14 curriculum guidelines, of which personal and social development is a part. Supporting evidence comes from Michael who said 'if the (visiting) teachers have been here (before) they may suggest some things to look at; either the group or the activities they do and whether to place emphasis on certain areas'. Although willing to involve visiting teachers in the selection of aims it is clear, in this instructor's case, that the choice of aims remain the prerogative of the outdoor instructor. When asked specifically if the programme was written up with activities or educational processes in mind Michael responded that 'some schools are looking at educational processes to promote what is going on within their class at that time but when it's written up as a programme, it's just written up as activities...'. It would appear therefore that it is not aims that are driving the programme but instead aims arise out of the activity after the activity has been chosen by the school. Integrating the activity choices of schools and the implementation of aims by the centre depends on individual commitment rather than structural support.

This becomes more apparent when considering what instructors consider to be constraints on the way they deliver programmes. The principal states that in some respects the venue is prescribed by the activity which Michael interpreted as, 'we (instructors) have our own choice of venue but sometimes, because of the nature of the activity (there is a set orienteering course within the centre grounds)...we will tend to work around the centre at the beginning. Abseiling could well be around the centre or we could go to a crag but we could be constrained by available transport so we'd have to stay at the centre to do certain things...The centre has areas recognised for various activities and as long as it's within those areas, we have freedom of choice'. This corresponds with Crowther's (1988: 12) claim that outdoor education 'doesn't have rigid content or defined subject matter. What is taught is determined by influences such as locality, equipment, manpower and even tradition'.

Notwithstanding these restrictions instructors here have a large degree of autonomy in the aims they are pursuing with their groups. As Chris observed '...(the principal) wouldn't specify certain objectives for this group..., not directly, it's for the instructors who are working with the group...'. Further evidence exists in the finding that of the four instructors who were asked whether the centre or the school had stated any objectives for that week all four said 'no'. Similarly once the activity had been determined neither of the four felt constrained in their freedom to choose the nature of aims. Throughout the observations there was nothing to suggest anything to the contrary.

Secondary Research Question 1d:

Are aims planned in advance?

If the setting of aims is within the remit of the individual instructor then the question may be posed 'to what extent are these aims consciously construed by the instructor as opposed to being whimsical acts of improvisation?' In this instance I was concerned to establish the extent to which instructors adopted or set aims prior to a group arriving. The content of preplanning provides such an insight. For example, in response to a question about planning Tim said that 'this morning all the control cards are done', meaning that the technical resources necessary to complete an orienteering course were the focus of preparation. The motive behind the planning was '...to get everybody around that course (some distance from the centre) in the morning and do another one here (at the centre)...'. Similarly Tim suggested that he will 'preplan tomorrow's activities so that they run smoothly' providing strong indication that preplanning is orientated more towards facilitating activities rather than achieving learning outcomes, unless of course the activities are considered to be aims unto themselves.

All of the instructors provided evidence of this sort to support the view that preplanning revolved around technical aspects such as safety, resources and the weather. Likewise the availability of transport dictated to a large extent the venues which could be used and therefore loomed large in the planning of activities.

However, it would be false to assume that the lack of formal advance planning suggests there is no informal planning. Referring to his own way of working Michael offered another insight into planning suggesting that he both reacts to stimuli he finds along the way and also plans what he will do. In the latter sense he operates from a position of 20 years experience at this centre and has come to recognise the combination of variables which lead to success in achieving aims. Michael stated that '...I might have a lesson plan for where I want to go that day but, if it's not working, I don't just follow it... if something crops up I can go off and do something slightly different as long as I remember what the aims are and as long as the children can meet the aims'. This approach was confirmed by my own observations where Michael was led into areas of activity and discussion by the pupils themselves. Since these were not predetermined, Michael used his experience to react to the children's needs.

Although planning is not necessarily a rational act there is a degree of consensus in the overall scheme of things. All of the instructors suggest they would feel unnecessarily shoehorned if they were to conform to a rational planning model. However there is a wealth of experience amongst this staff which agrees that responding to situations, whether they be to do with group processes or with regard to the environment they are in, is an ingredient of outdoor education of central importance. The instructors'

assumption is that a rational planning model would be too contrived and eliminate much of the serendipitous educational opportunities that arise along the way. This is a particularly difficult area to analyse. It is very difficult to discern individual instructor's understanding of planning versus serendipity when the overall aims, as I have already shown, are so vague. As an observer I had no doubt that the pupils were learning something, as an analyst I had no idea what, and neither did the instructor. This opens up another area for further enquiry to establish the relative merits of learning strategies based on serendipity in relation to more formal planning acts. This would have to take into account the flexibility of instructors and whether they are willing to be guided by learning opportunities or their own way of doing things.

Secondary Research Question 1e:

Are aims pursued on a day to day basis?

There is now some indication of a relationship between outdoor activities and instrumental aims. In the case where activities change from day-to-day, as they do in multi-activity programmes, a further question arises. Is there continuity throughout the week despite activity changes? To analyse this question the earlier finding that some activities are better than others for achieving different aims must be borne in mind.

The first point to note is that at this centre the same instructor stays with the group for the whole week. This avoids the situation where continuity could be compromised where different instructors bring different agendas to the same group.

In some cases continuity was observable in the teaching practices of instructors. The first instance I observed of this was on day one of the five day programme. Michael had led the group in writing a contract which included the line 'lets try and listen to everybody'. Later in the day when behaviour became disruptive Michael would refer back to the contractual agreement thereby maintaining continuity. This raises the issue of whether the instructor wants the pupils to listen because it is an educational skill from which they will benefit, or a more immediate concern about group management and discipline. This is an example where listening can be an aim in itself as well as having an instrumental function. However for the moment I am trying to establish evidence of continuity and in this instance the instructors self-stated aim is being continued throughout the week confirming evidential reliability.

A more cognitive and more educationally explicit example came from Chris when briefing the group at the beginning of a hill walk on day two. He asked the pupils to read from an interpretative nature board. Chris then asked if anything written on the board reminded them of what they had learnt yesterday. The group came up with the words 'wildlife', 'oak', 'birch' and 'deciduous' which they had discussed the day

before and which were referred to for the remainder of the day within the context of landscape interpretation. In this way aims were linked from past to present offering some continuity from day-to-day.

Continuity may also be found in relation to instructors' perceptions of pupils' abilities. I asked Paul why a particular venue had been chosen for a hillwalk. He replied 'I had a girl who I knew would be concerned on narrow slippery paths...I could have chosen a lower hill or a hill with less altitude but more physical distance but I chose this one and I knew that I could get off should the weather change'. The continuity, in this instance, comes from the instructors having observed and interpreted the ability of the group and has a direct relationship with the twin aspects of group performance and the instructor's concerns for safety.

Tim provided a hypothetical example of continuity suggesting 'if someone failed to abseil, this failure could be addressed later in the week where people could succeed'. Being hypothetical there are issues of validity since this desire to cater for continuity was not observed by me. What can be claimed from this example is that there are instances of continuity in the work of instructors and where examples are not in evidence, there remains a rhetoric that continuity is important.

An example of this rhetoric arose during an observation. Tim told me that his aims for the day were raising self-esteem and looking at issues of teamwork. However, despite the rhetoric these aims were not readily observable to me. The activity that day had been orienteering. Tim had the group working as individuals which he suggested would raise their self-esteem as they got better at the activity. This is the type of situation Barrett and Greenaway (1995) were referring to when the experience is left to speak for itself. As such there appears to be a belief on Tim's part that participating in the activity will raise the self-esteem of pupils. Following their solo effort the pupils were set off to attempt a more difficult course, this time in pairs. The fact that they were now doing a more difficult course led Tim to draw two conclusions. Firstly, that as individuals they were getting better at orienteering; secondly, in terms of instrumental aims they were moving from self-esteem to working as a team.

In this sense the continuity between aims was seen as progressive with self-esteem being a building block to develop teamwork. This seems a hazardous claim since the first orienteering course was completed as singles whilst the second in pairs. On the basis of this evidence, it is flawed logic to suggest a causal linkage between self-esteem and working as a team. It is also unsound to suggest a direct correlation between what people achieve as individuals and what two individuals achieve as a pair. The final piece of debatable logic relates to Tim's belief that simply by working in pairs would

develop pupils' teamworking skills. Because there was no evaluation of this activity it was taken for granted that the claimed aims would occur. Pupils may have developed their teamwork skills, but if they did there was no way Tim knew. Achieving the aims was therefore assumed which, as Barrett and Greenaway (1995) suggest, is an indication of something more recreational than educational. In one sense it is unimportant whether the aims are educational or recreational. What is important is the degree of correlation between what is claimed and what actually takes place. Once again there is enormous potential for discrepancies between the aims claimed (teaching objectives) and the learning outcomes. There are also question marks over the instructors' understanding of the processes required to achieve such aims.

Secondary Research Question 1f:

What is the relationship between aims and evaluation?

Having identified the type of aims which instructors claimed to be working towards, the issue remained over the extent to which attempts are made to see if these aims are being achieved. Here I look to the evaluation techniques adopted by instructors. In order to analyse these techniques I have developed two categories to explain the difference between first and second-hand evaluation.

• Primary Evaluative Techniques

This is a first-hand measure where the instructors themselves are central to the evaluative process. For example, Beinn Dearg has the pupils fill in a logbook on a daily basis and also at the end of their week long stay. The logbook is designed so that the pupils review their performance and they are encouraged to keep their logs for future reference. This can be described as a formal evaluative technique where every group in the centre is gathered to complete this task after supper. There is not universal acceptance that logbooks are a valuable exercise. Paul said 'we can get bogged down with whether we should put a full stop here or there on someone's logbook or whether we should include the weather or not...'. Differences in opinion exist between instructors as to what it is they are trying to evaluate. Tim was concerned that the pupils have enough to do already without having to do logbooks 'they can be bombarded (from when they get) up at 7.45 am...they have a great deal of physical activity, they come back at night...I think maybe a few notes to take with them when they go back to school...'. There is, therefore, no agreement as to why logbooks are necessary nor what it is the logbooks achieve.

Another primary technique involves single groups with their own outdoor instructor which takes the form of a group review. These reviews are not built into the programme but take place on the instructor's prerogative. Only one instructor had a formal debrief in the centre following an activity and this focused on goals that the

group themselves had set (Michael). One other instructor (Miller) conducted a morning review based on the previous days activity. The pupils were asked to rate the abseil on a scale of 1-10. Two said 9/10, two said 7/8 whilst one said 5. No criteria were offered as to what the pupils were being asked to measure leaving me unsure what the measurements actually represented. Some instructors preferred to review outside and these took place either during activities or at their completion. The only example of the former is that already mentioned, where Chris conducted a review on top of a hill inside a Zarsky sack. In terms of the latter Miller conducted a review following a bike session asking if anybody improved on their friendship and four said they had.

Another less formal method of evaluation takes place in the form of continual observation. For example, Paul said to me 'the girl who was with you was very nervous, very 'I cannae, I don't want to, but she can if she's encouraged'. The implication here is that part of the evaluative process is based on the pupils' success in doing something that they might have said that they did not want to do. On this occasion the evaluation focussed on the pupil's statement that she could not make the top of the hill. The fact that she eventually did leads to a straightforward evaluation in terms of her achievement of the activity. This approach is supported theoretically by Miller who said you could measure it (outdoor education) in terms of (saying) you've been in so many different environments. The measure of success in this form of evaluation therefore is quantitative based on the act of participation.

Much more difficult however was the claim made by Tim. I asked the question 'if self-esteem and confidence are two of the aims, how do you know when you've achieved those aims?' The reply was, 'I'm not saying it's an instinctive thing but it's quite easy to spot'. The ability to evaluate on this basis depends therefore on the instructor's perception. Similarly Tim suggested that by the end of week 'they have gained courage that they didn't have before'. The difficulty in evaluating the success of these claims is compounded by the fact that the pupils were not evaluated at the point of entry. This means that that their level of 'courage' was not assessed prior to the programme beginning so that it could be measured at the end to establish any difference. Such statements therefore raise issues as to what can actually be claimed in terms of outcomes by instructors of outdoor education. Indeed the same instructor acknowledges the difficulty whilst referring to evaluating self-esteem.

It's hard to quantify. If they've had a good week and they've enjoyed the week, I can see the difference but they can't express themselves on paper, they don't have exams at the end, it's only your perception when you met them on the Monday until they finish up on the Friday. You could write a report on each one but other than that, I couldn't...it's very hard to quantify. You know by the end of the week if they have achieved well, you can see it in the children and it's a more relaxed and confident team that

you've got by the end of the week.

On the other hand Chris offered a different perspective suggesting that if 'by the end of the week I've mentioned thirty various things, I'm not bothered if by the Friday...I wouldn't measure...I wouldn't assess them, I wouldn't judge how effective the week's been or how successful it's been by knowing everything that's been said'. Michael overcomes the problem of evaluation by asking children 'what have you achieved?' He then confided in me 'they can't really tell you. You've got to put suggestions to them and sometimes they will come back with things that you haven't suggested. They feel quite good inside about doing things but they don't see it as an achievement so you've got to explain what an achievement is and how small an achievement can be...'. However Michael shared Chris's tentativeness and remains cautious about the nature of evaluation stating that 'sometimes I can't quantify their achievements'.

The principal felt that despite pressures on outdoor centres to adapt and cut costs one common denominator remained: 'twenty years down the line we still have children walking out of here with a smile on their face'. The principal acknowledged that whilst it is possible to measure the impact on pupils 'the depths to which you want to measure it is the difficult one'. Clearly staff are having difficulty in dealing with the question of evaluation. What passes for evaluation tends to be either superficial observations, infrequent reviews, or logbooks whose value instructors tend to dispute. The difficulty arises when it comes to the evaluation of a substantive aim in relation to learning outcomes experienced by the pupil.

In summary, the way in which instructors deal with issues of evaluation indicates a belief that it is not possible to demonstrate to an external source the learning outcomes relating to the visit. Instead it should be left to individual interpretation. These were the very sentiments expressed by McDonald (1997: 377) which I discussed at the beginning of Chapter Three where he suggests 'we don't need independent research to prove the value of outdoor education; we believe in it'. It is a position which dissolves into relativism, where outdoor education can become anything the instructor wants it to be. This was the point I made earlier in this chapter where I argued that the unstated philosophy of outdoor education was one of existentialism. Despite sharing a theoretical affinity with this position what this empirical evidence shows is that the practice of outdoor education can become very untenable when, without methods of evaluation, instructors espouse aims that they have no means of knowing when, or if, they are realised.

In an attempt to unravel this I asked Chris how, in the absence of empirical evidence, someone external to outdoor education might come to understand its value? Chris responded, 'if he stayed for a week and went out with a group of kids on the hill, and

went through all the experiences that they'd gone through this week every day then he'd probably find it hard to explain himself, but hopefully he'd be able to see its value'. My line of questioning was trying to elicit how an educational service which is under threat of reduced local authority funding can respond in a positive, proactive and evidence based manner. Whilst not denying the potential value of Chris's belief it is not satisfactory because once again it is existential and relative, depending on the experience of one person. My purpose in leading the reader to this point is to indicate that, on the basis of the pilot data, residential education shows few signs of evidence-based performance.

• Secondary Evaluative Techniques

It is perhaps for these strategic funding reasons that remaining centres look to other means of determining value. The dominant discourse in this respect is the frequency with which instructors refer to the feedback received from school teachers. The principal has conducted small scale surveys of visiting teachers intended to establish customer satisfaction. Although I did not review the data the principal informed me that there was a high level of customer satisfaction (I did not feel the need as I interviewed visiting teachers myself). This was confirmed as I looked through diaries left in visiting teachers rooms asking for comments and guidance on customer relation improvements.

Instructors also use the testimony of teachers. Quoting a head-teacher Michael said 'when the children went back (to school)..., they really were a different class. It was like night and day. Michael said 'she was able to work with them in a different way, the way she would have liked to work with them in school while she was here. When she went back, she was able to continue working in a much more friendly way in school. From children who were literally disciplined all the time, they were not disciplined, they self-disciplined'. Michael also suggested that 'I know many other head-teachers who say exactly the same thing and that's why so many head-teachers want the children to come here'. The most forthright statement in this category comes from Chris who said, 'I think the people that actually see what goes on with the groups and are involved, definitely believe there are benefits, no matter how hard it is to quantify it all, especially (school) teachers'. Similarly Paul suggested that in class teachers 'we've got a good ally there'; and, in reviewing the weeks activities, Tim suggested '...the teachers saw a change'.

The ability to evaluate effectively has structural problems in that programmes of residential outdoor education represent but brief moments in the overall scheme of things. Take, for instance, an example of one school year of approximately 40 weeks. If a pupil is to visit a centre for one of these weeks this would represent 2.5% of the 40

weeks. If this visit were to be the only visit for the 7 years of primary schooling this would represent 0.36% of the pupil's primary school career. If these figures were extended to include compulsory school life (assuming no other outdoor education experiences) the figure would be 0.23%. The claims attached to a one week residential outdoor education experience must therefore take some cognisance of the numerical reality that the visit represents just under one quarter percent of a pupil's school life fading to statistical insignificance over a lifetime.

Despite exhortations throughout the United Kingdom in journal articles (Keighley, 1998; Hitt, 1990; Ernst and Donald, 1993; Williams, 1994) and a supportive OFSTED survey (Clay, 1999), Beinn Dearg lacks developed links between what happens in the classroom and what happens at the centre. In terms of evaluation this means that it is extremely difficult for an outdoor instructor to monitor progress and achievement simply because the level of entry is an unknown quantity as is the ability to measure lasting effects at the point of departure and after the pupil has left. This lack of continuity raises issues of the legitimacy of claims made by outdoor educators. Chris, for example, whilst confident in stating the observable outcomes of a skills based activity such as sailing is less forthright about a personal and social development review he led. He suggested that 'it's very difficult for us to monitor what effects that kind of discussion has...The only thing we can monitor maybe is how they communicate amongst their own group'. In terms of what can actually be achieved Chris stated 'I think a week is long enough to sow some seeds...it would be far more effective if it was followed up...'.

Instructors argue that continuity can sometimes be addressed where the class teacher accompanies their own class. The assumption is that class teachers know the pupils before they come, see them during the residential week and can monitor changes after. However this does not hold up for a variety of reasons. Firstly, it is not always the class teacher who is the accompanying teacher; second, when the class arrives it is split into six smaller groups and so even if the class teacher was present they would not be able to monitor the whole class. In evaluation terms these issues are not insurmountable, however, this leads to the final problem. There is no formal mechanism between the outdoor centre and the school which allows this to take place. Indeed, later on I will present evidence to indicate that visiting teachers prefer that the visit to the centre is a stand alone experience whereby they do not want to be engaged in follow up evaluation.

In short, the ability to evaluate is outwith the control of the outdoor instructor in any sort of integrated manner. It is difficult therefore to evaluate the extent to which anybody is achieving anything. Chris called into question the ability and

understanding of instructors involved in personal and social development stating 'it's very hard for us to learn to do social development with our groups'. It is perhaps the lack of evaluative mechanisms that leads to outdoor instructors placing such value in the positive comments received from classroom teachers.

One thing that links both primary and secondary evaluative techniques from the point of view of instructors is that they are based on anecdotal evidence. For example, Michael was asked if there was a permanence to what pupils learn at the outdoor centre to which the reply was:

I would be very surprised if there's not a permanence. Having spoken to pupils who have been with us many years before, their memories are vivid, it's more than just a memory and if what we've been trying to promote is on the personal/social development or in the skills, some of it must be there. Whether they take it on board all the time is very difficult to say but different people will take it on in different ways. I know of one person who is now a teacher who said it was one of the greatest things,...she had become a teacher partly because of the things she had enjoyed here as a pupil. She now saw what we did with primary children and reckoned if that could be followed up with the secondary... It encouraged her to go on to become a teacher.

Whilst instructors felt generally that anecdotal evidence was not satisfactory they nevertheless believed in their perceptual abilities to monitor progress made by pupils. For example, one of the questions I put to Michael was 'we were talking about measuring things earlier on and even if we don't actually know what has been measured, something has been done right?' In response Michael replied 'yes, that's right'. However, as a reminder Paul suggested that 'anecdotal evidence is fine but it can be dismissed'. Likewise, on the subject of evaluation Michael stated that, 'it's not really measurable, it's a gut feeling.'

In this section I have looked at aims and how they are evaluated and I have arrived at two distinct categories. *Primary evaluative techniques* at Beinn Dearg involve reviews and logbooks. Some instructors believe that the experience speaks for itself and no review is therefore necessary. For others they adopt this position not necessarily because they believe in it but because of the difficulty of quantifying and evaluating experience in any meaningful way. When review techniques are used it is not always clear what is being reviewed whereby the activity aims become muddled with the instrumental. In the case of logbooks there are a variety of opinions. At one extreme the instructor will read the pupils' logbooks from the evening before and offer feedback. At the other is the view that logbooks are a mere time filler in the evening.

When pushed further to demonstrate that their work is valuable instructors invariably

turn from their own abilities to evaluate educational outcomes and seek validity from visiting teachers. In this way instructors devolve responsibility to an external source. This cannot be helpful to claims of professionalism where internal validity must surely be of prime importance. Because of the indirect nature of this process I have adopted the term *secondary evaluative techniques*. I also presented evidence which shows structural problems whereby the links between schools and outdoor centres are not sufficiently secure to ensure integrated curricular needs. These difficulties have resulted in instructors suggesting that outdoor education is either unmeasurable or they defend it by referring to anecdotal evidence.

Secondary Research Question 1g:

What is the relationship between aims and organisational values?

In answering a previous research question (1c) I demonstrated how activities were programmed at an organisational level but instrumental aims were the prerogative of the individual instructor. In this section I am concerned to understand the extent to which organisational values influence the aims, values and practices of the individual. I sought to do this initially through talking to instructors about whether or not a mission statement, or other form of organisational mandate existed, and then, if in the affirmative, to discover what they understood the contents to be. Chris's response was that which most closely reflected the mission of the centre when he stated that it 'is to create learning opportunities for mainly personal and social development and environmental (education) and relate this to the school curriculum'. To quote the centre document *Mission Statement and Aims*, the centre 'aims to provide the practical and natural environments for the development of environmental education, outdoor activities and residential and social education which can be integrated with the visiting school's curriculum'. Michael was less sure of the contents saying 'I think we still have a mission statement'.

Although admitting to not knowing the mission statement it is clear from observations and interview responses that Michael was alerted to those aims contained within it. Indeed Michael referred to 'topic development sheets' and personal and social development aims he had been responsible for writing up. Similarly, Paul, when referring to the mission statement said, 'I've no idea, it's written down. I've seen it, I've read it and I've forgotten it'. When I asked the principal about these responses there was no expression of surprise. In fact the principal had anticipated these responses and, whilst acknowledging the mission statement was in need of revamp, suggested that differences in opinion did not equate with not following a similar organisational vision. It is clear therefore that it is not the mission statement which is the cornerstone of practice and so I sought to determine what was.

It is normal practice in centres for instructors to have an induction when they are first employed. As I have already stated the instructors at Beinn Dearg are long serving incumbents with the shortest full-time employee having five years service. Another employee was not officially employed full-time but through staff sickness and absences had been continuously employed for one year.

Chris whose induction took place in 1993 provided an insight into this aspect since, prior to being appointed permanently, he worked as a temporary member of staff and had the opportunity to shadow each of the present staff on all of the different activities. His view of the current induction was that 'what they (centre management) do with new 'temps' is very much concentrating on safety procedures, how certain things should be done...as opposed to educational objectives...'. This would explain why (the temporary instructor), when asked to describe the mission statement, described safety procedures and not the instrumental aims. However, this does not explain why the longer serving members (Paul and Michael) failed to describe the mission statements contents when asked. The answer would appear to be that the mission statement was written up in accordance with what the centre staff believed to be a reflection of what they were already doing. In this way instructors would not necessarily look to the mission statement to express their organisational ethos but to historical precedents. This holds true in that both Paul and Michael articulated the contents of the mission statement through unsolicited statements in other parts of the interview schedule. However, there remains an organisational issue which does not account for the induction of new staff into this hereditary ethos.

For example, Paul stated 'we're very weak on corporate direction', whilst Michael believed that individual personalities stand between a unity of vision, with similar evidence from Chris who felt that a certain individualism appears to dilute corporate identity. Expressing the tension that this causes Chris stated that the 'six staff might be going in different directions and they've got their own objectives and their own ideas about the job. If the six staff were a lot clearer about the objectives of the centre, and what the objectives were to be, then it would be a more enjoyable working environment...'. Referring to this individualism Paul agreed with Chris in saying that 'there are certainly considerable variations. There are those who have been here for a little while and they, at one stage, sat down and went through the reasons why they're doing (what they are doing) and what are the key elements of this session in this programme and why it's got to be done. That has been gone through, it has been written down, it has been lost and that's because it's not reviewed'. Paul went on to argue that the reason that there is a lack of corporate direction is because of the increasing financial pressures on the centre management. This is fully supported by the principal who said 'we have...swayed with the winds of change so our philosophy

of the day has been driven by the policies of the day'. However, there is a sense of defeatism in Paul's comments when he suggested 'there is absolutely nothing written down that says we've got to do the programme every day as it is, but it's easier'. He cited the associated problems of resources such as transport, equipment and climatic conditions as prohibiting a more adventurous corporate approach to the centre's aims. This particular insight indicates that programme development has been more utilitarian than educational.

Talking about outdoor education in a very general sense Miller was concerned that 'it appears to be so complicated because people are justifying it from lots of different points of view'. This conceptual diversity has practical problems when discussing initiatives or gaining consensus at an organisational level. Talking of putting forward new ideas at staff meetings Paul has at one time suggested, 'what about if we scrap (logbooks in the evening) all together...and do drama or art, we...do something else' but they just say 'oh, let's have coffee (or) shut up you silly fool...'. When pressed further on these institutional barriers to change Paul suggested that the resistance comes from the inherited skills and experiences that different instructors have and adopt, or, in his own words, 'you would have to do some sort of personal development with certain staff because not all the staff would be happy with it. It's the same as people having preferences for the technical skills, some are better at it than others'. This is a strong indictment against organisational harmony which also runs counter to the claim of its mission statement that personal and social development is its prime focus. Indeed Paul went further suggesting the staff group should 'expect things (of groups) at certain times and know...why it is happening, how the group develops and how it forms'. By implication therefore, individual staff have different priorities to the point that some cannot accurately claim to be working in the area of personal and social development. This is largely borne out in the sections above where I have shown that where evaluation takes place it is rarely consistent with the instructor's claimed aims. Using this framework of analysis it becomes apparent how staff room incidents, such as those Paul described, can become charged when different staff are working towards different agendas, bearing differing assumptions and with differing understandings of the nature of outdoor education.

Secondary Research Question 1h:

In terms of aims what is the relationship between theory and practice?

The history of outdoor education shows that the issue of definition has plagued writers (Royce, 1987; Hopkins and Putnam, 1993). Chris offered an insight which perhaps explains why: 'I think a lot of the time people say that there is mysterious magic in outdoor education. They are not too sure what they do or what goes on, it seems to be wonderful, but I think a lot of the time that can be a cop out...so they don't have to

analyse what they do, they just assume that what they do everyday means something, so they keep on doing it...'. This is a powerful testimony since Chris did not restrict his comments to Beinn Dearg but beyond into the wider profession and so I looked to secondary sources to check Chris's assertion.

Priest and Gass (1997: 178), for example, describe six different ways of reviewing experience. If Beinn Dearg was to be measured against these criteria they would feature in only two of these possibilities ('letting the experience speak for itself and 'speaking for the experience'). I do not want to enter further into the relative merits of the other four possibilities so much as to say this is an example of the void between the practice of outdoor education at Beinn Dearg and theoretical sources. Consequently, the individualism referred to above, together with some of the entrenched values relating to outdoor education, magnify the difference between theory and practice. The poor theoretical grounding appears responsible for the lack of consistency and is perhaps best summed up by Miller's statement 'outdoor education is all things to all people...so many things to all men '.

Part of the reason for this is that there is no agreement throughout the profession about the nature of training. The qualifications and experience of Geraldine and Tim are a case in point. In these instances National Governing Body awards form the basis from which these instructors practice. Talking of his own Tim continued, 'the bottom line is the qualifications (NGB awards) where you start, and then the (educational) processes later, you build up yourself'. The key point here is that NGB awards do not include personal and social development in their syllabi and, as I have demonstrated above, the instructor induction process at the centre does not include any personal and social development. Also research shows that there is no staff training in this aspect (Nicol, 1999). This means that, in this case, the instructor has to develop those ideas on the job. Since instructors work in isolation it is quite likely that ideas will develop more in keeping with individual intent than corporate identity, professional competence or theoretical underpinning.

In trying to establish the theoretical underpinnings of practice and the sources from which instructors kept up to date with current developments, I questioned them about which outdoor organisations they belonged to and which outdoor publications they read. None belonged to the National Association of Outdoor Education which is supposed to represent the interests of outdoor educators in the United Kingdom including Scotland. Nor did any of the instructors read publications other than those of national governing bodies. Nobody, for example read the *Journal of Adventure Education and Outdoor Leadership*, a publication for outdoor educators which, incidentally, is not bought in by the centre. None of the instructors could name a

particular practitioner, theorist or writer who inspired their current work.

I then tried to discover the instructors' definition of outdoor education. Michael did not have one. Likewise Tim said 'I haven't really thought about it'. On the other hand Paul suggested it was about 'self awareness and environment, then there's physical, spiritual, social, that sort of development, personal growth...its not a subject, its a process...'. Chris thought it to be 'using the outdoors as a vehicle to create learning,...learning technical skills whether (in a) kayak or in a (sailing) boat...I like the thought of something they might use later as a recreation...'. These definitions, tentative though they are, reflect the inconclusive way in which those who write about outdoor education have dealt with definitions (Chapter Three). Notwithstanding the fact that nobody reads the *Journal of Adventure Education and Outdoor Leadership*, there is not, as I have shown in Chapter Three, a large theoretical body of knowledge to support practitioners in the United Kingdom. This means that the enquiring mind would be drawn towards the body of literature emanating from, in the main, North America and there is evidence to suggest such literature is culturally specific (Bowles, 1996) and therefore of questionable value to the United Kingdom. This is an area that requires research attention.

In summary it would appear that sources of new ideas are left more to chance than being actively sought out. In some cases staff share ideas although as Paul suggested 'the majority of staff don't'. Chris, more by accident than design, was alone in suggesting 'I was definitely influenced by seeing other instructors working and maybe pinching little bits that I liked...'. Both Paul and Michael referred to sources of new ideas coming from college placement students and, on some occasions, new staff brought in on temporary contracts. It would appear therefore that many of the core ideas currently in practice were brought to the organisation when each instructor joined. Chris offered an example in this respect: 'I suppose it is really through my own experience, I was very fortunate when I was at school that there were instructors who took you hill walking. I gained a lot from that experience...'. Bearing in mind the slow turnover of permanent staff at this centre it would appear the organisation is quite insular in terms of ideas. This is compounded by the absence of theoretical constructs relating to practice. It is perhaps this type of relationship between theory and practice that Kant (1933: 93) was referring to when he said 'thoughts without content are empty, intuitions without concepts are blind'.

Summary of Pilot Study

In this chapter I have addressed the following question:

Primary Research Question 1

What is the nature of outdoor education as perceived by the instructors employed within local authority outdoor centres?

I set out to determine the range of aims that instructors work towards throughout a week-long multi-activity programme. To account for this diversity and with a view to analysis I developed a three point conceptual framework to investigate these aims.

These are:

Substantive aims: so categorised because they were both stated (verbal) and recorded (written) by the instructor for the pupil to both see and hear,

Intended aims: so categorised because they were stated but not recorded. They were more expressions of intent lacking the pithy content of substantive aims but nevertheless remain a dominant discourse amongst instructors,

Consequential aims: so categorised as they are not necessarily exclusive to outdoor education but arise as a consequence of pupils participating in an activity or living residentially and having to fend for themselves.

The primary research question was then subdivided into eight secondary questions (1a to 1h).

My initial data suggests that activities appear to be used in two ways. The first is where the instructor believes that outdoor education should allow pupils to experience the activity for its own sake. In this way students are given a taste of the activity which may well influence their recreational choices in later life, a position first identified by (Parker and Meldrum, 1973: 14) as 'leisure education'. The second area is where activities are used as a means to develop aims found in the area of personal and social development. Both recreational and instrumental aims are not always seen as independent of each other with some instructors believing that they operated towards both simultaneously.

When speaking of activities there was a tendency to talk of aims by naming the activity (hillwalking, orienteering). Personal and social development aims were expressed either using this generic term or more specifically as 'self confidence', 'self-esteem' and 'teamwork'. I have made a tentative note that I felt that in most cases there existed a rhetoric of language where the observation of action did not match. The evidence I have presented does not support the breadth of aims claimed, nor that personal and social development has been purposefully operationalised and incorporated into programmes.

Instructors tend to distinguish between recreational and educational outcomes. Where the aims are recreational then the activity is of little relevance since the aim is inherent in the participation. The choice of activity is then dependent more on programme and resource considerations than educational ones. Where the aims are more educational the data from the interviews suggest that instructors at Beinn Dearg believe that certain activities do bring better results, as is claimed by Keighley (1985) and Cooper (1997).

Whilst schools select their own activity programme from a menu of choices they do not, as a rule, select the day-to-day aims. This is left largely to the instructor who has a great degree of autonomy in deciding which aims to work on. Evidence shows that visiting teachers are normally happy to take a secondary role and relinquish responsibility to the 'expert'.

In no instance were there any plans written out in the manner or extent that is expected in, for example, primary schools. Any planning that did take place was implicit with instructors 'knowing' but not stating what they were going to do for the week. This may be seen in relation to an emergent form of planning where instructors would respond to learning opportunities as they became available during the activity. Some instructors favoured this emergent approach in addition to choosing particular sites where they knew 'things would work' implying some form of prior planning. There was a belief that any form of rational planning would work against the serendipitous learning opportunities that invariably present themselves when outdoors.

Where the instructor adopts either a serendipitous, or 'letting the experience speak for itself' approach, there arise issues of continuity. In these instances outcomes are not stated and any continuity occurs by chance rather than design. In other cases there are apparent links in a very generic sense where a stated aim for the week is 'listening'. However, I have suggested that, in this context, listening is as much a safety and behavioural issue as it is a transferable skill. The programme at Beinn Dearg is structured in a way that has some potential for continuity since each instructor will spend the whole week with one group. However, this relationship, consistency in maintaining discipline, together with loosely defined generic aims, such as listening, are insufficient to suggest that there is continuity in the day-to-day aims of instructors. Nor can that continuity extend beyond the five day visit because of the structural divisions separating what happens at the centre from what happens at school.

In terms of the aims that the instructors themselves have said they are trying to achieve (the activity itself and personal and social development) the activity aim appears unproblematic. Introduction to a new (or relatively new) activity is straightforward since it is easily definable and measurable in terms of skill development and

participation. The area of personal and social development is much more problematic. I have shown that in many cases personal and social development is misunderstood and there is a tendency to hide behind this generic term at the expense of being specific about what is being achieved. Personal and social development becomes a slogan and is articulated in this amorphous manner, a 'catch-all' to include everything without articulation. Statements from the instructors themselves show that the term is not well understood nor successfully operationalised. It would appear that clearer understanding is necessary so that personal and social development aims are redefined into something more focussed. In this way it would be easier for aims to be clearly stated and articulated by the instructor.

Because of the nebulous understanding between instructors and the operational challenges of personal and social development it is difficult to evaluate the extent to which anybody is achieving anything. Pupils and visiting teachers generally leave feeling that the visit was worthwhile, and that something, generally to do with personal and social development, was achieved. Personal and social development therefore represents a vague, inarticulate umbrella term which masks instructor individuality and engenders a rationale for professional self-protection. As a means of understanding this I have suggested that Beinn Dearg articulates these claims by way of two methods which I have called 'primary' and 'secondary' evaluative techniques. Primary evaluation (logbooks, reviews) is used for pupils to record technical elements of their day or to ask them to relive an experience. The value of such techniques elicits various responses from instructors ranging from those who see logbooks as a waste of time to those who would like to see them being developed to reflect the needs of the children and the school curriculum. In all cases the techniques are more prescriptive than evaluative leading to confusion between activity and instrumental aims.

Instructors use what I have called secondary evaluation techniques to provide, through indirect means, a rationale for their work. In such cases instructors use the testimony they receive from visiting school teachers as a means of support. Since this testimony is very positive it acts as a mediator of success. The most common example of this is described as the pupils behaving better in the classroom. Because the concept of personal and social development is accepted without critical interpretation there are difficulties in identifying what happens at an outdoor centre that leads to the behavioural changes that visiting teachers claim. This is compounded by the fact that when children depart they generally do so in high spirits having had a good time. It is perhaps this 'feel-good' factor that has obscured the need for evaluation. Consequently, there is no empirical understanding of the relationship between processes and outcomes. These difficulties have resulted in instructors suggesting that outdoor education is either unmeasurable or alternatively, they will defend it by

referring to anecdotal evidence. This is another area of research which begs further attention.

The mission statement is not a driving force at Beinn Dearg. It is a reactive summary of what the staff already do. However, the nature of the induction points to the priorities at the centre. The content is exclusively technical focusing on site selection and safety. Whilst entirely understandable it is, at the same time, symptomatic of the driving force and hence value orientation of the centre. Where this technical element has been challenged in the past it was met with opposition. This points to an organisation bearing conservative values finding itself, incapable, or, at the very least, resistant to change and new ideas. The principal manages this situation by allowing each instructor to express their individuality. However this pluralist approach is not necessarily consistent with consensus seeking and can lead to unresolved decisions and corporate disharmony.

There is no evidence of staff paying any attention to theoretical concerns. Reading professional journals, staff training or attendance at conferences are not commonly acknowledged to have any relevance to the practice at Beinn Dearg. In this way any coherent justification breaks down in favour of relativism. This relativism is reciprocal in nature since it allows instructors to work in obscurity whilst denying the relevance of theory. Consequently, there is little agreement as to what the centre is trying to achieve and evaluation is defined by perceptions of worth as opposed to what the pupils learn. Without theoretical validity instructors have, ironically, had to look outside of their existential boundaries (to visiting teachers) when pressed on what they are trying to achieve. Such claims, I have argued points generally to a profession which lacks internal validity.

However, despite the philosophical issues I have raised about lack of consistency, difficulties in evaluation, poor organisational ethos, the obvious hiatus between theory and practice, the dependence on external validation, the lack of empirical evidence; there is evidence that there remains something of intangible worth. I followed up the instructors dependence on visiting teachers perceptions by questioning them myself. These were impromptu interviews, fitted in when I saw the teacher free. These took place either during the activity or in the evening. They were not electronically recorded although I took notes afterwards. I interviewed five visiting teachers. The interview consisted of only two questions: 'in what way do you value outdoor education?' and 'are there any changes in the pupils after their visit to the centre?'. The interviews were conducted in keeping with the principles of purposive sampling particular to emergent methods of data collection (Silverman, 2000). As Maykut and Morehouse (1994: 57) explain 'as we collect information from our first research participants and begin to

analyse this data, we will learn what are the important or salient dimensions in the phenomenon we are studying. These preliminary results will suggest to us who or where to go next...’.

My interviews with school teachers confirmed the instructors’ views that they all held outdoor education in great esteem and that there were marked changes in the behaviour of pupils when they returned to school. This, they argued, made classroom discipline much easier and led to greater pupil attention spans. Of course this is to a large extent a self-selecting sample since the accompanying teachers are at Beinn Dearg because they have ‘volunteered’ to be there. If a truly representative selection was chosen then this would need to include those teachers from schools who had never been to an outdoor centre and might not share the same belief and confidence in it. However, this belief in outdoor education corresponds with Cheesmond and Yates (1979) research which showed that both teachers and pupils placed a high degree of value on outdoor education. It would appear that in the absence of evaluation, outdoor education instructors have looked to different modes of expressing value. Amongst all the conceptual analysis, I have provided evidence to show that there are some examples of instructors who, on an individual basis, display a range of talents in programming, evaluating and reflecting on their work, albeit in microcosm.

Finally, despite instructor testimony to the contrary, environmental education at Beinn Dearg does not have a high profile. The belief that it does arises from the confusion between definitions and outcomes. I have categorised what passes for environmental education into the categories Countryside Code and countryside interpretation. The former is about rules whilst the latter is essentially descriptive, both lacking an active pupil involvement with knowledge in keeping with Reason’s (1998) four point epistemology. Instructors can therefore successfully argue that environmental education is central to their work if they adopt the Countryside Code and countryside interpretation approaches. However, I have suggested that this is at the expense of the aims, content and methods of a developing form of environmental education about which the instructors at Beinn Dearg show little knowledge. The primary reasons for this being, an exclusive view (on the instructors part), of the nature of outdoor education, fostered through the lack of staff training opportunities, allowed to happen in the absence of an authoritative professional body and magnified by the gap between the practice of outdoor education and theoretical developments elsewhere. It is particularly relevant to note that of the five school teachers I interviewed none mentioned environmental education as a reason for them being at the centre. Once again this finding strengthens the view of instructors that personal and social development has a higher priority than environmental education.

These findings changed the whole nature of the thesis. Prior to the pilot study I had intended using the pilot stage to identify areas of 'good practice' (in relation to environmental education) and use these as a basis to develop outcome measures to evaluate the experiences of pupils in relation to environmental education. However, what the pilot data shows is that there are certain barriers which prevent the delivery of environmental education. The change in direction was based on my own assumption that environmental education will not flourish in an organisation that does not want to do it. It seemed to me that the first step in the process would be to see if this finding was common to all centres. If so then the next step would be to understand why, despite the claim that environmental education takes place at centres, it has such a low profile in practice. This I felt would lead to another stage to indicate what it would take for change to occur. Whereas before the research focus was leading towards learning outcomes (pupils), now it became centred on teaching objectives (instructors).

INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIPS

Part of the analysis in Chapter Five dealt with whether the outdoor activities component of outdoor education represented a legitimate form of education or served merely as a form of recreation. The discussion from Chapters Three and Five would suggest that no form of educational endeavour, whether curricular or not, has intrinsic worth. Subjects are included in the curriculum because of the value that society places on them. What constitutes 'legitimate' education therefore is whether or not society values the subject as opposed to the subject having intrinsic worth. Consequently the debate as to whether activities are educational or recreational cannot be complete without a socio-cultural critique of the way in which society values educational endeavour. This is a philosophical issue which will not be resolved by empirical means alone, nor is it restricted to the narrow sphere of outdoor education. It is a task that requires detailed attention in its own right.

For the moment this is as far as I need to go in dealing with outdoor activities in the present context. I am less interested in this debate and more interested in their instrumental uses. Thus, I can now focus further on the instrumental claims related to environmental education and personal and social development. I will be guided by the research question which asks:

In what sense is personal and social development environmental education?

In Chapter Three I sought, through the use of secondary sources, to set out themes and historical parameters in which the primary data in Chapter Five could be considered. This might be perceived as a deductive process whereby the gathering of empirical data is directed by theoretical concerns. It also corresponds with Creswell's (1994) point that research governed by deductive reasoning will have a structure in which the theoretical component is situated towards the beginning of the study. Creswell also makes the point that theories are found in the literature and since I have consulted secondary sources prior to presenting primary data, it is possible to conclude that the primary data collection was driven by theoretical concerns. I must, however, modify this reasoning as the numerical sequencing of chapters masks the actual process.

The process began with a series of 'hunches' (supported by the opinions of colleagues in the sector) which can be summarised in the belief that not much environmental education takes place in local authority residential outdoor education centres. This

tentative idea was supported by the data from the pilot study which concluded that there was an imbalance between the importance instructors attached to environmental education and that given to personal and social development.

Since these ideas guided the compilation of the interview schedule to follow, this part of the thesis is not necessarily deductively driven. For example, Chapter Three consists almost exclusively of secondary sources. It was written on the basis of its relevance to the collected data but *after* that data was collected. This method might therefore appear more inductive where data collecting precedes, and is the basis for, establishing theoretical propositions (May, 1993). At first glance this appears to be what I have done since the data sets about to be presented are each summarised by a theoretical proposition. However, a number of research texts suggest that the polarity between inductive and deductive is over-emphasised and unnecessarily abstract (e.g. Creswell, 1994; Miles and Huberman, 1994; Mason, 1996). Since I wanted to be guided by my assumptions, but not necessarily hidebound by them, I have been influenced by Scott and Usher's (1996: 57) claim that 'as fieldwork proceeds, the researcher's initial hunches, hypotheses and conjectures are gradually refined and reformulated, and this acts progressively to focus analysis and reorganise data collection'. This concurs with May's (1993: 29) view that social research may legitimately draw on elements of both inductive and deductive processes and 'should render the attachment between theory and data as close as possible'. In this sense the portrayal of inductive and deductive reasoning as polar opposites collapses into the conceptual rather than factual whereby reasoning is guided by what Donaldson (1978: 107) terms as 'theories in action'.

This approach is particularly suitable to my thesis since, as I have shown in Chapters Three and Five, outdoor education lacks a coherent theoretical platform. By this I mean that no-one in the United Kingdom has treated outdoor education to the scrutiny in the way, for example, Piaget investigated intellectual development, where he constructed 'a far-reaching and closely woven net of argument, binding together so many different features of the development of behaviour...' (Donaldson, 1978: 19). Of course Donaldson (1978) herself would come to test and reject elements of this platform. However, it was the existence of Piaget's platform in the first place that formed the basis for her own thinking and allowed her the opportunity to begin her own observations and experiments. In this manner Donaldson (1978) built upon and extended Piaget's 'net of argument'. It is this type of platform that I am suggesting is absent from outdoor education literature. There is no 'closely woven net of argument' only bits and pieces. As Creswell (1994: 21) states, 'one of the chief reasons for conducting a qualitative study is that the study is exploratory; not much has been written about the topic or population being studied, and the researcher seeks to listen to

informants and build a picture based on their ideas'.

The interview and observation format follows the same procedures as the pilot study. Whereas in the pilot study all of the instructors had been interviewed (six), the pilot showed that this sample rate went beyond the point of 'saturation' for that particular site and new data was not forthcoming (Maykut and Morehouse, 1994; Silverman, 2000). Consequently, in sampling the other four sites, only two instructors were chosen. Their selection was based on the longest and shortest serving staff members. By including the other four sites what I was effectively doing was increasing the individual sample size of respondents for this particular stage from six in the pilot study to a total of fourteen. The observations lasted one day and the interviews, immediately after, lasted approximately one hour.

Throughout the interviews the instructors were encouraged to diverge from the interview schedule. This is in keeping with the view of open-ended questioning where the format consists of 'a detailed set of questions and probes (designed to) discover what is important to the interviewees, within the broad boundaries of the interview topics and questions, and pursue these new discoveries in the interview' (Maykut and Morehouse's, 1994: 83). Whereas each respondent was required to answer every question, the order of the schedule was rearranged when respondents, in the course of answering one question, happened to answer another question appearing further down the list. Additionally, I allowed the respondents to diversify where they appeared to be adding fresh insights.

Allowing respondents to articulate an understanding of the aims of their work in outdoor education produced a wide array of responses. With around 90,000 words of interview text expressed in the form of open-ended questions the ordering of the data had to be managed.

Coding

The interview transcripts were coded manually with pencil markings in the margins. Every line of text was dealt with and, where appropriate, a heading appended. In reading the text I decided on a coding system under the headings of:

1. Aims
2. Philosophy
3. Evaluation
4. Activities
5. Personal and Social Development
6. Environment
7. Technical Skill

The process I have engaged in thus far has been summarised by Miles and Huberman (1994: 91) as a ladder of abstraction where ‘you begin with a text, trying out coding categories on it, then moving to identify themes and trends...aiming first to delineate the “deep structure” and then integrate the data into an explanatory framework’. As I have already indicated the term personal and social development is conceptually vague preventing insights into ‘deep structure’. The raw data are examples of this because when the individual data items were removed from the text they appeared to me to represent a random list. I needed to develop a sharper focus and further refine the coding system by developing them into themes prior to analysis. The solution lay in a system adopted by researchers who have approached similar data categorisation by using a typology. Taylor and Bogdan (1998: 144) suggest that typologies ‘can be useful aids in identifying themes and developing concepts and theory’. With this in mind I have used typologies to order those aims articulated by instructors in the search for ‘deep structure’. In this instance each typology consists of a data set and a proposition.

The criteria which guided the development of each data set and its accompanying proposition was; first, the similarity that I perceived between each data item which indicated a coherent data set; second, the textual context within which the instructor responded at the time; and third, my understanding of secondary sources where certain responses showed consistent similarities with the wording of these sources. This was particularly so in respect of the Scottish Office Education Department Curriculum and Assessment in Scotland 5 -14 National Guidelines. The document titled *Personal and Social Development* in particular makes specific reference to outdoor education and provides the framework from which the propositions relating to personal and social development have been derived. These similarities proved useful in the construction of the propositions and so key words drawn from the four propositions have direct relevance to the PSD document and may be summarised thus:

- Propositions one and two are about interpersonal relationships (this chapter)
- Proposition three is about self-esteem (Chapter Seven)
- Proposition four is about self-awareness (Chapter Eight).

In developing the propositions I was concerned about the extent to which the data set corresponding to each proposition was homogeneous. Consequently, when I had arranged the data into sets myself I then conducted what Silverman (2000) calls an inter-rater, or inter-coder, reliability test. The purpose of this was to establish consistency amongst the data items in each proposition and to see if the appended

proposition fitted each data set. What is being tested is the reliability of the coding scheme and is particularly important when the answers to interview questions have not been pre-coded. As Bryman and Cramer (1990: 72) observe 'when such exercises are carried out, more than one coder should be used to ensure that the coding scheme is being consistently interpreted. This exercise would entail gauging the degree to which coders agree on the coding of themes deriving from the material being examined'. The test was conducted by arranging all of the propositions on the floor. The inter-rater was then asked to locate each of the data items alongside the most appropriate proposition and in so doing compile their own data set. The inter-rater was told that the propositions were drawn from the 5-14 documentation (the inter-rater is a primary school teacher currently practising in Scotland and consequently familiar with the 5-14 documentation). By using a primary school teacher as an inter-rater I wanted to ensure that the validity of the emerging framework was constructed from both an outdoor education perspective (my own) and a school teacher's perspective (the inter-rater). I wanted to establish whether there was a common understanding. In this way I would be able to establish the consistency of incoming data whether that data came from a teacher or instructor. This had the added advantage of being able to generalise and also to compare between what teachers were saying and what instructors were saying.

The initial ordering consisted of over 100 data items which were developed into 12 propositions. At a very early stage I recognised that the task of analysing all of these would be beyond the scope of this thesis. The four that I chose were selected because of the issues which arose during the inter-rater process and the very obvious connection with the 5-14 curriculum. Consequently, what is actually presented is only approximately one third of the original exercise. The four propositions and their inter-rater scores may be viewed together in Appendix One.

Of these four propositions there was an initial match of 25 of the possible 32 data items (78%). This meant that the inter-rater and I disagreed on seven items. These were removed and without further guidance, the inter-rater was asked to make a second choice with the seven that did not match. From this ordering the inter-rater matched a further five (16%). Of the two left (6%) the inter-rater was told the interview context in which the data appeared and with this knowledge agreed with my original allocation. It should be remembered that the inter-rater's task was not restricted to these four propositions since the task included the allocation of data items to all 12 propositions. This made the inter-rater's task considerably more difficult than the figures relating to the four propositions suggests.

What I am doing with these propositions is using them to develop a conceptual

framework. In working towards this I am adopting Wurdinger's (1997) use of critical analysis whereby the task is to understand why people do what they do by articulating the assumptions on which they operate. Since the assumptions are largely invisible the challenge is to gain access to them. In order to accomplish this, as Wurdinger (1997: 24) points out, 'one must first identify assertions from which assumptions may be drawn'. My immediate task therefore is to collect assertions (the data items) made by instructors about their work and from these identify the hidden assumptions. It is by this process that I aim to examine the general aims relating to outdoor education. In so doing I seek, by indirect means, to answer the research question posed at the beginning of the chapter and establish the extent to which environmental education is present in the way outdoor educators perceive their work. Consequently the interviews and observations which led to these data did not directly address the concept of environmental education. Instead, I wanted to collect my data without respondents knowing my research interests.

Proposition One
In terms of interpersonal relationships instructors define aims in a conceptual sense.

Data Items	Score
Building relationships	0
Trust building	0
Teamwork	0
Bonding	0

These data items have a zero rating as a result of findings from the inter-rater reliability test. What this process showed was this proposition is inextricably linked with proposition two (outdoor educators use certain indicators to identify and observe interpersonal relationships within the context of group processes). The relationship between the 'aims' (proposition one) and the 'indicator' (proposition two) is not always clear. In other words the distinction I made between propositions one and two was not shared by the inter-rater. In writing the propositions I was influenced by what I saw as two distinct orders of explanation. For example, 'helping each other over obstacles' (proposition two) could be an 'indicator' towards 'building relationships' (proposition one). This logic would suggest that by engaging in acts of mutual help pupils would establish new and meaningful relationships with each other. However, depending on one's starting point the inter-rating process demonstrated to me that the opposite might be true. That is to say, 'building relationships' (proposition one) between a group of people may well enable that group to help 'each other over

obstacles' (proposition two). Either situation begins with a matter of perception and is related to the overall objective. However, in order to restore some order to this puzzle I should point out that if the latter is the stated aim (getting over obstacles) then this is by definition a narrow set of prescribed tasks. The former, on the other hand, relates to a potentially wider range of situations. The dilemma that this problem poses came to light when the inter-rater found that certain data items appeared to belong to one of the first two propositions which concurred with my own rating. However, the inter-rater could not distinguish between the two propositions until I indicated that I had used 'building relationships, trust, teamwork and bonding' to represent the conceptual aim (proposition one).

Reflecting on this process we found that the inter-rater was influenced more by the term 'interpersonal relationships'. I, on the other hand, had written and structured the propositions whereby the interpersonal relationships were of secondary importance to the idea that certain processes appeared to be *used as indicators* that interpersonal relationships were being formed. However, this confusion over means and ends has led to findings beyond the realms of the initial reliability test. The confusion represents, first of all, an indication that when phrases are removed from the interview transcripts the context in which they are used may not always be self-evident. As May (1997: 30) has observed,

if we assume that we can neutrally observe the social world we shall simply reproduce the assumptions and stereotypes of everyday actions and conventions. We need to understand and acknowledge these influences in our own thinking and that of society in general. Facts in other words, do not speak for themselves...

Understanding within the social world must therefore depend on identifying those assumptions. In this instance the data items of proposition one (teamwork, trust building, bonding and building relationships) are elusive concepts in definitional terms and, most importantly, are underpinned by certain assumptions. Inherent within their meaning is the assumption that by working together groups of people produce a form of synergy whereby the sum is greater than the parts. Visual manifestations of this are apparent in posters bearing the acronym TEAM (Together Everyone Achieves More) which appeared in three of the five research sites. This visual slogan corresponds with Adair's (1987: 95) pronouncement of team working as 'a common task and complementary contributions'. These visual manifestations are replicated in the way that instructors talk of their work. For example, during an interview Geraldine said the sort of aims she normally looked for were *team bonding*. Commenting on what pupils get out of a residential visit Chris remarked, 'I suppose it's a fresh start for them... *building relationships*'. During an activity observation I recorded in my field notes,

‘the instructor (Sammy) reminded the group regularly that *teamwork* was the aim of the day’. Lastly, Jane suggested, ‘its very difficult to learn to *trust* people and I think it’s something that you have to build up’.

In all of these cases the instructors appear to be using the data items I draw upon in line with proposition one, as the end result, or intended learning outcome. This is consistent with the manner in which activities are used to achieve those aims. For example, of the five research sites four of them have ropes courses which the instructors readily associated with ‘teamwork’, ‘bonding’ and ‘building relationships’. A pattern therefore emerges suggesting that what I have summarised as proposition one represents the aim.

However, Tim believed that the pupils use ‘teamwork to get through the activities’. This appears to invert the notion of means and ends whereby completion of an outdoor activity is the aim and teamwork the manner of achieving it. Tim’s comment challenges the conception of proposition one since it is counter to the range of secondary sources which suggest that activities are the vehicle to achieving interpersonal aims (Greenaway, 1990; Hunt, 1989; Hopkins and Putnam, 1993; Barrett and Greenaway, 1995). Despite the weight of evidence against Tim’s claim and bearing in mind May’s (1997) warning about reproducing assumptions I identified the claim as an example of what Miles and Huberman (1994: 269) call ‘an outlier’. An outlier may take the form of a statement which stands out as contrary to the surrounding data and therefore tests the generality of the developing framework. Rather than being ignored these exceptions are to be embraced to guard against complacent theory building.

Significantly, this particular outlier corresponds with the difficulty that the inter-rater had in determining ends and means. Before accepting the validity of proposition one I began to re-evaluate it from a different perspective, that of the outlier statement. This is in keeping with Silverman’s (2000) view that one method of increasing validity is to analyse data from a perspective other than your own. I considered the fact that the outlier had come from an instructor with less than a year’s experience working in outdoor education. I determined to find out if the outlier is the result of differences in the experience and/or training of instructors.

Of the fourteen instructors interviewed for this stage, six have studied outdoor education at either undergraduate or postgraduate level. Since I did not directly ask the content of their degree curriculum I will assume for the moment that all of them studied aspects of pedagogy relating to interpersonal relationships. In adopting this assumption I am giving the benefit of doubt to allow for the *maximum* amount of

training instructors *may* have received. However, of those six, three qualified over twenty years ago which leaves only three people of the fourteen who *may* have studied this area in the last five years. Since I considered this alone to be a tenuous basis of pooled knowledge I consulted a survey I undertook which included recent trends in staff development (Nicol, 1999).

Of the ten local authority residential outdoor education centres in Scotland eight responded (including all five of the sites included in this thesis). Within the period July 1997 to July 1998 none of these centres, nor their local authorities, provided staff training for personal and social development with resources being allocated instead to activity based training. This is not in itself evidence that such training has not taken place in the past. However, of the fourteen instructors none were members of the United Kingdom professional body the National Association for Outdoor Education (now known as the Association for Outdoor Learning). This means there were no observable links between current national developments in outdoor education (AfOL membership includes access to journals and newsletters which feature training opportunities). Bear in mind also that there is no formal qualification in personal and social development available for outdoor education instructors, nor is pedagogical experience necessarily a condition of employment. For example, referring to recruitment guidelines, the principal at Ladhar Bheinn stated, 'I am looking for people who have national governing body awards as I can't use them otherwise, things like driving licenses...'. In this manner practical considerations subordinate educational processes and the lack of an integrated approach to training undermines the claims made by instructors in relation to personal and social development.

I pursued this issue further by asking all fourteen an open-ended question about the sources of ideas that informed their work. The intention was to invoke responses of a less formal nature where, for example, personal reading may have had an influence. No responses which indicated instructors had read in the area were forthcoming. It was not my intention to set out to establish the extent of such training and the evidence that I present is by no means conclusive that training in these aspects has never taken place. Accepting the limitation of open-ended questions it is possible that any such reading may not have been mentioned even if it did take place. However, personal reading alone will not lead towards a shared understanding of an organisation's rationale, to say nothing of the wider implications of what personal and social development means to outdoor education as a profession. Given these findings it is difficult to imagine the forum in which ideas about personal and social development, as stated in the 5-14 document, are developed into a philosophical and methodological approach suitable for the delivery of outdoor education. The point is that within the context of a developing

conceptual framework, significant doubt emerges as to whether the training and experiences of instructors meet their needs in what is one of their self-stated major aims (delivering personal and social development).

Explanations as to how this situation has come to be originates from a common theme. Jamie (Lochnagar) explained, 'the staff spent some time deciding on the centre philosophy when the centre was first established'. However Jamie went on to explain that this exercise has not been replicated since. I recorded in my field diary 'just because everybody sat down 16 years ago and discussed philosophy then, does not mean that it is appropriate now'. Jane from An Teallach commented that 'everyone's being doing it for years...without questioning'. Chris from Beinn Dearg said that 'you do not get the opportunity to get out very often to see exactly what (other staff) are doing'. Sammy, from Ladhar Bheinn, maintained that the underlying theme explaining why instructors do what they do is largely 'ephemeral'. The fifth centre, Carn an Fhithleir, was the only place where I observed staff training during research field work (1999). In this instance the content involved a morning session on philosophical and educational processes.

In common with other centres who operate assistant instructor training schemes (An Teallach, Ladhar Bheinn and Lochnagar), those who are being trained are new staff. They in turn are being trained by an existing senior staff member. However, the issue still remains that where there is a low turnover of instructor staff, those who have been there longest do not have the opportunity to discuss what it is they are doing nor why. Their role in staff training is that of trainer and not learner. What is being passed on to the newer staff therefore is a codified form of practice, embedded in and particular to, each organisation.

One possibility that Tim's outlier statement suggests is that instructors have adopted a rhetoric of personal and social development which is not theoretically grounded. I will explore this issue further by use of a vignette. Vignettes are used to illustrate rich pockets of data 'taken to be representative, typical or emblematic in the case you are doing' (Miles and Huberman, 1994: 81). Consider first the service length of Tim's five other instructor colleagues. Individually they have been employed for 5, 12, 12, 18 and 20 years amounting to 68 years combined service. This represents an average of over 11 years each (figures are for service at this centre alone). The median figure of 11 represents a significant difference between, on the one hand, one year's service, and on the other, 20 years of service. Bearing in mind that Tim has been employed for one year I was concerned to find out the nature of induction he received when joining. In response to such questioning, Tim replied that the instructors role is to introduce 'them

(the pupils) to the activity in a safe manner'. He further felt that to be able to teach personal and social development was something that you picked up 'on the job'.

In terms of employment history this is a second career for Tim having retired from full-time employment elsewhere. This is not an uncommon situation with one other centre employing similar retirees. The facts therefore are these. Tim is employed by a local authority residential outdoor education centre. Notwithstanding national governing body awards he has no formal qualifications in outdoor education. His induction did not include anything in relation to educational processes, aims, nor how to achieve them. In short, Tim has been left to draw on his own experiences and find out for himself the content and pedagogic processes involved in teaching a subject without any formal training in the developmental needs of that particular age range of children.

It is not surprising therefore that there appears to be confusion over means and ends, aims and outcomes. It could be argued that Tim's employment as a temporary instructor suggests his case is different from the other staff who are employed on permanent contracts. This analysis does not stand up however, for five reasons. Firstly, although on a temporary contract Tim has been employed on a long term and continuous basis for that year; secondly, I have already presented evidence which casts doubt on the training of the permanent staff; thirdly, all of the other centres I have used as research sites employ temporary staff and I have used the centre that Tim works at as an example of the site with the least temporary staff so as the extent of the issue would not be overestimated. The fourth reason comes from the statement made by Iain who suggested that historically going outdoors was seen as 'a good thing' and 'personal and social development (was) pegged on afterwards'. Lastly, secondary sources (McDonald, 1997) support Ian's claim that personal and social development was retrospective.

It seems absurd that such a major claim, with abundant support from secondary sources (Parker and Meldrum, 1973; Dartington Report, 1975; Mortlock, 1984; Hunt, 1989; Hopkins and Putnam, 1993; Higgins, *et al.*, 1997), exists as an 'added on extra' without consensus as to what is to be achieved and deprived of a forum in which this might be addressed. This can only lead to misunderstanding as to the nature, content and potential outcomes of interpersonal relationships specifically and personal and social development generally. In this respect the most lucid point has come from Miller who works at Beinn Dearg. Responding to questions on an activity I had observed, Miller made the following point: 'you could say that was a teamwork exercise but the thing is...would that improve their teamwork, or did they just do it because they were told it was teamwork?'

This is a fascinating insight. What Miller is implying is that something can exist called 'teamwork'. Activities are used to develop teamwork. The relationship between the activity and the teamwork is underpinned by the assumption that teamwork is a concept which can be learned by engaging in an outdoor activity. However, when May (1997: 30) warned above about being careful not to 'simply reproduce the assumptions and stereotypes of everyday actions and conventions' this is exactly the type of issue he was referring to. Miller is challenging the assumption that teamwork is something which can be learnt from riding a bike (the outdoor activity in question). He is arguing that pupils are merely displaying the behaviour they feel the instructor expects of them. In such cases the intention to deliver interpersonal relationship aims are far from the perceived wisdom of being liberating but more in line with a form of indoctrination. In other words pupils are performing acts of teamwork because they are told to. This is an example of White's (1989: 7) critique where personal and social development 'is being used as an instrument of "social control" of pupils for other interests than their own'. The picture that begins to emerge is that the interests being served are those of the instructor (whose work has been fashioned by historical precedent) rather than student-centredness.

This is not restricted to biking. A similar instance occurred as I observed an instructor working with a group on a ropes course. Stan gathered the group, crouched them down with their arms around each other and began reciting the slogan 'Together Everyone Achieves More'. The group were then shown techniques which if applied correctly would allow the group to successfully negotiate the ropes course. By implication, failure to use these techniques would result in failure to complete the task. As the activity progressed I recorded in my field notes, 'the group inevitably (it seemed to me) failed and were gathered together for a review (as above). Stan asked why they had failed, to which the reply was "because we did not work as a team"... When asked how they could improve (they added) "by listening to each other and communicating" (another learned response from the instructor)'. On the basis that pupils were working on a learned response they eventually succeeded because they now knew the task from the 'failed' attempt and were adopting learned roles from the last attempt. There is a possibility that it wasn't so much that they worked as a team as that they were mimicking proven rules. The distinction being made is between token acceptance or compliance on the one hand and the internalisation of the need for teamwork on the other.

In another case, during a gorge walk, the instructor (Mark) told me the group were failing to look after each other as one person was finding the activity physically difficult and was, as a consequence, lagging behind. He challenged the group to stay

together to support the 'struggler'. They were told if they achieved this (staying together) they would be allowed to extend the activity (in keeping with group consent). Consequently the group did stay together but by adopting Miller's line of argument it could be argued that they stayed together not as a result of improved interpersonal relationships but out of the behaviouristic characteristic that if they did they would be rewarded. The point is that the extent to which this instance actually contributed to interpersonal skills remains unknown.

In a further example Paul said to his hillwalking group that 'we must stay together since we are happier together'. I asked Paul how staying together made people happier, how it contributed to teamwork and how this allowed for some people who may feel happier walking up the hill alone (relatively speaking)? Paul confided that his comments were not directed towards group processes but that staying together was a group management issue. That is to say it is easier from a safety point of view to control a group of eight pupils when they are together than when they were scattered around the hillside. Notwithstanding the relevance of the safety argument here is an example where the rhetoric of interpersonal relationships is being used as a facade. These three very different examples show that the rhetoric of instructors' testimony relating to interpersonal skills is not necessarily consistent with the internalised experience of pupils. In support of Miller's argument Stan, Mark and Paul provided examples not necessarily of lasting interpersonal processes but instead of conditioned behaviour. In both Stan's and Mark's cases the conditioning is where the pupils enact those roles expected by the instructor. In Paul's case there is a mismatch between the potential outcomes he shares with the group and his own ulterior motives regarding safety. This is in itself a conditioned response since in my interview with Paul he stated that 'I have got to ensure that that they gain in their personal and social skills'.

These comments would suggest that activities are context specific and may not have learning significance beyond that of the context in which they were enacted. So when Tim stated that groups 'respond to teamwork which they're going to need in later life' he endorses the view whereby the development of interpersonal relationships has meaning beyond the specific context of the outdoor activities in which pupils engage. This tension between activities as ends or means and whether they represent lasting educational processes or not remains, as I have demonstrated in this context, unresolved.

It is the difference between rhetoric and reality that vindicates the need for the type of critical analysis that Wurdinger (1997) postulates. Through these 'assertions' about teamwork the 'assumptions' on which the instructors are operating appear to be firstly,

learning does take place; secondly, that learning which occurs relates to interpersonal relationships; thirdly, learning is internalised and has a lasting effect.

In relation to the data items within this proposition (building relationships, trust-building, teamwork and bonding) there exists no coherent attempt at determining whether these outcomes have been achieved. Instructors tend to rely on their own observations as to whether their aims in this respect have been successful. This invariably means evaluating pupils' performances on a task-related exercise such as negotiating a ropes course. This proves nothing other than the context specific ability to perform that task itself. The extent to which lasting interpersonal processes have been achieved go, without exception, unrecorded.

Conclusion of Proposition 1

Taylor and Bogdan (1998: 145) suggest that 'propositions are either right or wrong, although the researcher may not be able to prove them'. To deliver a verdict on this proposition I have presented strong evidence to suggest that the claims surrounding interpersonal relationships are both vague and misleading. They are vague because the conceptual understanding between ends and means is not transparent nor are they articulated by instructors on request. They are misleading because the assumptions underpinning the relationship between outdoor activities and interpersonal learning outcomes are largely unchallenged. Given this weight of evidence it is tempting to conclude that proposition one is 'wrong'. However, in dealing with propositions Miles and Huberman (1994: 75) suggest a rating system including terms such as 'strong', 'qualified', 'neutral' or 'contradictory' which indicate the strength of the relationship between the data and their proposition. I would like to add another category and call it 'dependent'.

This added category is necessary and arose out of the finding that instructors actually do define interpersonal relationships in a conceptual sense. Given the data I have presented, what can be more conceptual than teamwork? If conceptual is taken to mean some form of inner generalised notion without external embodiment, then proposition one may be deemed to be true. However, this would apply only at a very superficial level because the validity of proposition one is not whether it is right or wrong since, in this instance, this form of polarity itself is conceptually misleading. The actual strength is that the proposition *itself* brings to light assumptions which underpin the thought processes responsible in adopting a right or wrong approach in the first place. This is to say that if you begin with the assumption that proposition one is achievable, a self-fulfilling prophecy mentality 'kicks-in' to legitimate existing forms of practice. This superficial relationship between assertions and assumptions becomes apparent when

the assumptions are made explicit. With this in mind it is possible to go on and explore the *indicators* that instructors use when referring to interpersonal relationships.

Proposition Two

Outdoor educators use certain indicators to identify and observe interpersonal relationships within the context of group processes

Unlike proposition one, where all the data items were rated as 0 the remaining propositions are rated between one and two. The number 1 indicates agreement between myself and the inter-rater on the first occasion and the number 2 the second time match.

Data Items	Score
Chatting as if we were friends	2
Looking after each other	1
Getting on with each other	1
Helping each other over obstacles	1
Listening to each other	1
Communicating with each other	1
Gaining new experiences without squabbling	1
Staying together whilst participating in an activity	1
Being kind and polite with each other	1
Co-operating with each other	1
Empathy for the whole group	1
Taking responsibility for each other	1
Supporting each other	1
Pupil involvement in decision making	1

Despite the challenged assumptions between ends and means in propositions one and two the interpersonal relationship link between the two remains. Perhaps the most lucid expression of this came from Michael who said ‘it’s the team-member I’m looking for but not thinking of them as team-members (so much as) the traits of a team member...’. This statement renders the vague concept of teamwork meaningful in the sense that there appear to be indicators (traits) which are both observable and achievable. For example, the first data item of proposition two, ‘chatting as if we were friends’, is an objective set by Chris which he expected to achieve on the day I observed (the activity on that day was a hillwalk). Chris provided many stops along the way and at times initiated conversations and at others let them develop. What was clear to me as an observer was the simplicity of Chris’s stated objective. The nature of the

conversation, voice tone and body-language provided him with tentative evidence to indicate whether the group were indeed chatting as friends. Equally the same indicators could be used to determine when the objective was not being met. On these occasions Chris would intervene and challenge the reasons why people might be angry with each other. In this way he was constantly addressing the theme of friendship. There are clearly definitional issues surrounding the nature of friendship and the apparent superficiality of the claim being made. However, given the very short time pupils have at the centre then this is one example where claims are not being exaggerated.

Furthermore, that he was 'constantly addressing the theme' indicates a continual process and this represents the greatest difference between propositions one and two. In proposition one there is an assumption that there is an end result. This is to say that the aim inherent within the first proposition is that the group will become a 'team', they will 'bond', 'build trust' or have 'built relationships'. In proposition two however this is not the case. There is less suggestion that as a result of being on a residential outdoor education course that people will become friends. This is despite the fact that most will know each other before they arrive and many may well be friends already. There is more of an understanding that whilst on this course pupils will be prompted to explore the idea of what it is to be friends. Therefore regardless of past relationships or potential future ones, the instructors appear to be exploring the values and attitudes surrounding friendship. In essence the differences between propositions one and two have conceptual origins. Whereas the relationship between the instructor and pupil in proposition two is exploratory, in proposition one the relationship is more normative, inasmuch as the instructor has a dominant role in the attempt to create teams and bonding, build relationships and trust.

Looking through all the data items in this proposition these concepts are affirmed. In proposition two instructors are engaged in active processes whereas in proposition one it is about end products. In this manner pupils, throughout their stay at the centre, are constantly challenged to respond to these processes. Although the activity context may change from day-to-day the glue that holds proposition two together is the role of the instructor. It is the instructor (not the activity) who is instrumental in achieving the desired aim relating to interpersonal relationships. This corresponds very closely with the *Personal and Social Development 5-14* document (SOED, 1993c: 13) where attention should be paid to 'roles, interactions, values, communication and behaviour in one-to-one and group situations'. Therefore this is curricular validation for work undertaken at outdoor centres.

Having demonstrated both an instructor and curricular view that activities can be a

means to another end the evidence suggests that this is not always the case. Indeed, some evidence suggests quite contrary explanations. I have graded these alternatives into three discrete levels of explanation.

• Level One

The first is where consensus does not exist to confirm that participation in outdoor activities develop interpersonal relationships. Mountain biking is an example of this. Of the five research sites two offered mountain biking (Beinn Dearg and Ladhar Bheinn). From these two sites I observed and then interviewed two instructors from each site (four instructors in all). Of these four, three said that the activity was purely physical and technical and represented a poor basis from which to develop interpersonal relationships. The fourth felt that the consideration shown by faster riders who waited for slower riders demonstrated some basis for interpersonal development. Two of the four who felt mountain biking irrelevant to interpersonal development came from Beinn Dearg indicating a degree of agreement between instructors at that centre (a point established in the pilot study). This was not shared by Ladhar Bheinn where the responses showed a different degree of emphasis by the two instructors. This therefore indicates that tensions exist within and between outdoor centres as to the relevance of activities in relation to interpersonal aims.

• Level Two

The second level however goes beyond simply a 'degree of emphasis' and indicates outright contradiction. For example Jane (An Teallach) believed that archery is an activity more suited to an adventure holiday than a residential outdoor education centre and that it is more about 'fun and spills' than education. Iain (Ladhar Bheinn), on the other hand, believes archery can develop reciprocal 'trust' between instructors and pupils through the introduction and compliance with procedures relating to range discipline. Which of these claims is the more accurate is an issue of debate. Common to both positions, however, was the absence of empirical evidence and the dependence on anecdote and rhetoric to argue their respective cases. For the moment, however, I wish merely to demonstrate that such contrary differences exists between centres.

• Level Three

This level suggests that the pursuit of certain activities promotes the very character traits which personal and social development presumably aims to challenge. Skiing is one such activity. Taking place often on a crowded area of the mountain environment pupils are required to show consideration to other users and to wait their turn in queues for uplift facilities. However, the public perception of skiing is nothing to do with consideration for others. A cursory glance at associated literature promotes a

perception of speed, image, individualism, brand advertising, designer clothes and equipment (see for example the Snowsport Scotland Handbook, 2000). Talking of this activity Iain stated there is a 'big danger (from) all the outside influences of selfishness, damaging the environment and rushing to beat everybody else to get to the front of the queue...It doesn't necessarily follow on that it's a good thing that's happening'.

I have ordered the three levels to indicate an ascending level of dissonance between aims and activities. That such an order can be devised is compelling evidence that a range of contradictory views exist as to what it is that the activities are designed to achieve. It is also a clear indication that the data I have presented relating to aims are not in themselves sufficient to understand why instructors express their aims the way they do. There is a difference between what the instructors say they are aiming to do, why they do it, and the explanations adopted to rationalise their work. The most obvious example of this being the manner in which instructors persist in using activities which, in the case of archery and skiing, contradicts their own purported aims.

I suggest that the reason for this is because instructors are willing to work hard at adapting interpersonal outcomes to what they have traditionally done (teach outdoor activities). However, this has developed out of an uncritical acceptance of what outdoor education has traditionally been perceived to be. As Jamie suggested, 'I think that for everybody who is involved in outdoor education there is this overwhelming tide of feeling that it is generally a good thing, that children do benefit from it'.

By implication therefore, what instructors are not prepared to do, in a universal sense, is to ask themselves if the pursuit of outdoor activities is necessarily the best way to achieve stated interpersonal development aims. Instructors therefore have become adept at adapting what they already do in light of changing external conditions. These adaptations have resulted in the use of terminology loaded with sociological connotations with particular historical biases. This is why a great deal of 'sloganeering' remains around the conceptually vague notions of, for example, teamwork. In order to justify their existence instructors have learnt to change the rhetoric surrounding their work but not ask why. I am not suggesting that teamwork, or any of the other data items in proposition one, has no place in outdoor education so much as challenging the way it is defined, implemented, and the appropriateness of the outdoor activities used in order to achieve these aims.

Summary of Proposition One and Two

Since both propositions one and two refer to interpersonal relationships they are located within what the 5-14 *Personal and Social Development* document recognises

as 'social development' (SOED, 1993c: 12-15). Within this context I have presented evidence which suggests that the terminology and practices of instructors indicate two distinct but linked understandings. Proposition one represents an abstract and vague conceptualisation which I have argued does little to clarify the actual work of instructors. This has happened for two reasons, firstly because of inherited practices leading to unchallenged assumptions; and second, even if it was proven to work (there is no conclusive research to demonstrate one way or another) it would appear that the short stay at a residential centre is not sufficient time to foster the qualities of wider social integration (Roberts, *et al.*, 1974). These findings have been expressed by McDonald (1997: 298) who suggests the belief that 'shared adventure builds teams is a hoary myth'. This raises the question of what benefits can legitimately be expected to arise out of a week-long residential outdoor education programme? As a result the claims made in proposition one are overstated.

The combined problems of unchallenged assumptions and overstating the case has caused confusion over ends and means. For example, interpersonal relationships can come to be seen as something which instructors can develop in addition to, as well as arising out of, delivering outdoor activities. There is a culture of uncritical acceptance amongst instructors which has flourished because of a general reluctance within centres to acknowledge that training in the delivery of interpersonal relationships is necessary. This in turn has led to a confusion over values and aims. Terms such as 'teamwork', 'trust building', 'bonding' and 'building relationships' have come to be valued because instructors believe they legitimate the work they already do. However, in the process, these ideas have come to be seen as end results, something that could be achieved by the end of a course. The assumption is that pupils can return to class and community with the appropriate experiences to fulfil a variety of interpersonal roles.

I have suggested that proposition two is more realistic in terms of interpersonal relationships. It is more realistic for two reasons, firstly the data items contained are readily achievable and observable within the duration of a week-long residential; and second, the way instructors talk and act indicates that they are conscious of being engaged in part of a process. In Jane's words 'my aims today are to develop awareness of what qualities make a good team, and what are their own strengths and weaknesses, to give them some ideas that they can take with them to work on in the future. The whole week is an introduction...'. From this perspective instructors are not suggesting that pupils will become a team. Instead they explore the values surrounding the adoption of different roles looking at the traits of team members. They are not normative impositions in the way that the data items from proposition one are. The activity becomes of secondary importance to the instrumental role of the instructor. In

this manner interpersonal relationships become a process to be engaged in with the recognition that the process is never complete.

The purpose of this chapter was to explore the term personal and social development. In so doing I was seeking answers to the research question 'in what sense is personal and social development environmental education?' I had been following Cooper's (1991: 11) reasoning that 'environmental education is inseparable from personal and social (development)'. However, there is no evidence from these research sites that this is the case. When instructors claim to be operating in the realm of interpersonal relationships there is little indication, on the basis of the framework developed in Chapter Five, that they are engaging in processes relating to environmental education.

The only two exceptions to this are the same categories identified in the pilot study. These are the 'Countryside Code', which is about telling the pupils to respect the environment and how people should behave in it and 'countryside interpretation' where instructors like to identify and name features.

Chapter Seven

SELF ESTEEM

The theme of the previous two propositions (Chapter Six) was interpersonal relationships. These were presented within the context of social development. The next two propositions refer to personal development (this chapter is about self-esteem and the next, Chapter Eight, is about self-awareness). The purpose of all three chapters (six, seven, and eight) is to explore the term 'personal and social development' with a view to understanding its relationship with environmental education.

The difference between the personal and the social can be found in the Latin prefixes *intra* meaning 'within, on the inside' and *inter* meaning 'between and among' (*Oxford Dictionary of Current English*, 1984). The combination of the personal (within and inside) and the social (between and among) has come to be understood by outdoor educators under the umbrella heading of personal and social development (Higgins and Loynes, 1997). Personal and social development is defined as 'a fundamental aspect of the education of the whole child (and) is essentially concerned with the development of life skills' (SOED, 1993c: 1). Donaldson (1978: 114) describes the relationship between the personal and social thus: 'when it comes to self-esteem not even a young child depends entirely for his judgments on the views of others'. Cooper (1997) points out that a degree of overlap will necessarily exist between the twin elements of the personal and the social but from a teaching perspective it is possible to distinguish one from the other.

The next two propositions investigate this interplay between the personal and social by focussing explicitly on the individual, his/her self-image and the role of the instructor in creating learning opportunities to nurture personal qualities. In keeping with the 5-14 guidelines these propositions were written to include those aspects of personal development defined as 'self-esteem' and 'self-awareness' (SOED, 1993c: 8-11). Whilst the 5-14 documentation offers a ready made framework for analysing these particular data another framework has emerged out of the analysis of earlier propositions. The relationship between the two frameworks may be understood by thinking of a tartan rug. The propositions represent one pattern of data ordering and analysis, and may be considered to be the horizontal threads of the tartan rug. The vertical threads are represented by the category of aims (substantive, intended and consequential) identified in Chapter Five (the pilot study). The thread I am about to introduce represents a *diagonal* where the overall framework represents an intersecting pattern of ordering and analysis from three different but interwoven perspectives.

An Emergent Framework

In summarising propositions one and two I concluded that my data shows the centres investigated lack an objectively valid conception of aims, methods and content. This conclusion has directed me towards the 'hidden curriculum' agenda of outdoor education. I have reasoned that if an objectively valid conception is largely absent then instructors are operating on the basis of unspoken assumptions. I intend now to articulate some more of these assumptions with a view to establishing the extent to which claims can legitimately be made of a five day residential outdoor education programme. To explore the validity of these claims I will be using a framework of analysis which has emerged from the preceding data. In summary therefore the propositions will be evaluated using these five criteria:

1. Aims
2. Assumptions
3. Content
4. Methods
5. Claims.

This framework has its origins in the system I devised for coding interview text. The headings then were 'aims, philosophy, evaluation, activities, personal and social development, environment, technical skill' which developed as a coding system in the pilot study (Chapter Five) utilised as a process of data ordering (Chapter Six) and reworked into a framework of analysis (this chapter). This is in keeping with the view of Miles and Huberman (1994: 21) that 'conceptual frameworks can...evolve and develop out of fieldwork itself'.

Proposition Three

Outdoor educators provide contexts and experiences to raise self-esteem

The numbers appended to each data item are used in the same manner as Chapter Six. The number one indicates agreement between the inter-rater and I on the first occasion (72%), the number two the second time match (14%); and three, where the match was determined on the inter-raters understanding of context (14%). The challenge now is to interpret proposition three in relation to the conceptual framework.

Data Items	Score
Develop confidence	1
Try things	3
Personal achievement	1
Overcoming fear of the unknown	2
Development of belief in self	1
Learn practical things	1
Being able to cope	1
Encouraged not to be afraid of failure	1

Aims

In a review of research literature in outdoor education Barrett and Greenaway (1995: 40) found that ‘the enhancement of self-concept is the most frequently cited psychological outcome of participation in outdoor adventure’. The basis of this claim rested on the definition that self-concept is ‘the feelings and beliefs that one holds about oneself’ (Barrett and Greenaway, 1995: 56). This definition corresponds closely with the 5-14 documentation which defines self-esteem as ‘the value which a person puts upon himself or herself’ (SOED, 1993c: 10). All of the major outdoor education texts published in the United Kingdom throughout the 1990s concur with Barrett and Greenaway (1995) about the centrality of self-esteem (Hopkins and Putnam, 1993; Higgins, *et al.*, 1997; Cooper, 1998; Keighley, 1998). The views expressed in secondary sources correspond, without exception, to all of the instructors interviewed who recognised self-esteem to be a major part of their work. These expressions took two forms and were either explicit, whereby instructors verbalised the term (six did this), or implicit, where the other eight instructors mentioned outcomes readily associated with these definitions of self-esteem. These findings correspond very closely with those from the pilot where the former (explicit) could be understood as a substantive aim and the latter (implicit) an intended aim. In summary, both primary and secondary sources promote the view that self-esteem is an aim of residential outdoor education.

Assumptions

Evernden (1985) has suggested that real authority in society lies in unquestioned assumptions. Assumptions take many forms ranging in scale and magnitude from the ontological belief in the existence of a God (Teichman and Evans, 1995) to the ideas and practices which inform everyday life (Bauman, 1978). Assumptions therefore are beliefs which exist in all social situations, one of which is the workplace where beliefs are both formed and informed by the people who work there (Handy, 1985). Whilst recognising that assumptions are a necessary informant of theory and practice,

Wurdinger (1995: 10) warns that 'to operate under the same assumptions because of 'tradition or laziness' may well undermine the practice they are supposed to support. By combining Evernden's (1985) explanation of where real authority lies with Wurdinger's (1995) concern about the perils of tradition or laziness the challenge becomes the identification and uncovering of those unquestioned assumptions. What I am trying to do is to raise questions that may point out discrepancies between theory and practice.

Following the style of analysis developed in Chapter Six (after Wurdinger (1997)) the first step is to identify assertions which are articulated here as aims. In this instance the aims have been stated in the proposition above that 'outdoor educators provide contexts and experiences to raise self-esteem'. The aims represent a statement of intent which is what instructors say they do and may be distinguished from what they actually do. In order to evaluate the proximity between the rhetoric of the intent and the reality of the practice it is important to understand the assumptions upon which the aims are based. By uncovering these assumptions and relating them to the aims I will make explicit the foundation of practice.

From the data set attached to the proposition above I would suggest that instructors and principals are operating on the basis of three assumptions:

1. Gains in self-esteem arise out of participation in outdoor activities
2. Self-esteem is raised when people feel good about themselves
3. Such feelings are closely linked to personal achievements and success.

Content

Given the assumption that the self-esteem of pupils will be raised as a result of participation in an outdoor activity it is important to understand the relationship between the two. Cooper (1997: 25) states that 'a key word in education is success' suggesting that in regard to self-esteem it matters little what the activity is so long as it is delivered in such a way that pupils succeed. There is of course a built in assumption that the pupils want to participate in the activities in the first place and their self-esteem is not affected by their lack of enthusiasm. Whilst there are undoubtedly instances of reluctant pupils, my own observations together with the fact that the pupils (or their parents) actually pay for their visit, suggests a strong case of enthusiasm to participate. This view is supported by testimonies from all instructors, exemplified by Max who suggested that 'things like going kayaking are so exciting, children really warm to those kind of activities'. In short all instructor testimony supports assumption one that self-esteem arises out of participation in outdoor activities.

Assuming, therefore, the willing participation of pupils, instructors tend to use the terms 'success' and 'achievement' synonymously and both as mediators between the activity and the raising of self-esteem. In this way the terms 'success', 'achievement' and the other data items in proposition three ('confidence', 'trying things', 'overcoming fear', 'learning practical things' and 'coping') are used as measurements which link with assumption two, that is to say, self-esteem is raised when people feel good about themselves. This finds support in secondary sources with Barrett and Greenaway (1995: 7) suggesting that 'overcoming a fear (and) physical exercise' increases self-esteem. So, if an instructor can identify when the pupil is coping, overcoming fear, achieving and being successful, then there is a strong connection between the first proposition and the second. Participation in the activity leads to success and achievement, which is then used as an indicator of raised self-esteem.

However, this connection depends upon both definition and evaluation since what is an achievement or success for one pupil may not be for another. Moreover, what is deemed an achievement or success will vary from one instructor to another and situation to situation. The way in which instructors talk of successes and achievements therefore is central to understanding this. In an incident I observed on a ropes course Henry (instructor) hoped one pupil would 'really feel that she'd accomplished something, she managed to get up there (on to a high rope) and I think she is definitely one of the girls that "I can't, I can't, I can't". But she's not going to get back down, she's not going to walk back down the ladder, she will go for it and do it and I think she just needs a little bit of pushing (metaphorically). So I think for her to do (this activity) was brilliant...'. This example encapsulates all of the data items in proposition three where Henry views the pupil as overcoming fear, developing confidence, trying things, achieving and developing self-belief, all through engaging in a practical outdoor activity.

This was a fascinating episode clearly illustrating what this instructor means by success. Pupils were fitted out with safety equipment and asked to climb a ladder to a platform some five metres from the ground. They were then asked to leave the apparent security of the tree they had just climbed, walk out onto a horizontal plank with nothing to hold on to and then jump into midair. They had to trust that they would be arrested by the safety equipment and not hit the ground. There were shrieks of delight from each jumper, added to by their supporting peers below. In addition to representing a manifestation of success this particular activity is an example which clearly delineates the difference between success and failure (i.e. between jumping and not jumping). If success is defined in this way then there were varying degrees of success. Where some showed signs of nervousness the instructor was more willing to praise those on a successful outcome than those who appeared confident. In this way

praise was apportioned to favour the less confident or nervous and was directly proportional to the length of time a pupil spent hesitating, apparently fearful of jumping.

This type of activity should be viewed quite differently from something like hillwalking. Getting to the top is an achievement and the group's physical ability is taken into consideration by the instructor to accommodate this. It demands prolonged physical effort by the pupils. Iain suggested that hillwalking is not as exciting as some other activities but is a 'mature thing'. Here therefore are two distinct experiences where on the one hand participation in the ropes course is seen as a specifically focussed, high intensity emotional experience with a short time-span, whereas hillwalking is more physical with low intensity emotional output, taking place over a longer time-span. Both, however, are intended to result in the raising of self-esteem through success and achievement. This is not to say that there are no overlaps between the emotional and the physical, yet when instructors talk of aims they more readily associate emotional experiences with short high excitement activities and physical experiences with more prolonged activities. These findings correspond with another empirical study which distinguishes between two different types of experiences (Rubens, 1997). Narrow adventure consisted of a 'short time scale of experience (and) high thrill challenges' whereas broad adventure consisted of a 'long time scale of experience (with) some or much effort involved (and with) responsibilities devolved to students' (Rubens, 1997: 36).

At this point it is apparent that the nature and type of activity has direct consequences on the desired aim whether emotional or physical, broad or narrow. It would appear therefore that assumption three '*such feelings are closely linked to personal achievements and success*' has some validity. So long as the deciding factor is instructor testimony this remains true. However, it is this testimony Evernden (1985) was referring to when he asserted that real authority lies in unquestioned assumptions. What is at stake here is the validity of the instructors' claims that they are raising self-esteem. Because the rhetoric of raising self-esteem is so embedded in instructor testimony there are no questions asked about whether or not self-esteem is being raised. Therefore the authority rests in the testimony and there are cases where that authority is not necessarily reflected in practice.

This became apparent as I observed an abseil activity where pupils are required to step backward over an edge. This would fit into Ruben's (1997) category of narrow adventure. Like the ropes course activity this requires, quite literally, a leap of faith. The point at which 'the leap' is required is the crux. In such activities these cruxes are the key to whether or not people succeed. For the more confident pupil there is no real

crux in that going over the edge is a more or less uninterrupted part of the whole experience. Where this is the case going over the edge appears simply to heighten the excitement. The key point to this is that the experience is moderated by the instructors who are generally determined that everyone should succeed in getting from top to bottom.

However, success is not guaranteed and where there is hesitancy on the pupils' part there appears to be an intensification of emotional experience focused particularly on the technically straightforward aspect of turning backwards and walking over the edge. In these cases it is not always clear who is succeeding. During one observation the instructor was coaxing a particularly nervous pupil over the top. After twenty minutes of laboured movements accompanied by exhortations from the instructor, the pupil descended to the bottom. At this point the instructor turned to me, beamed, and said 'that is what it is all about'. It was clear that the instructor had taken pride in his part in achieving this success but as an observer my thoughts were coloured by the obvious distress shown by the pupil over an extended period of time.

I do not want to suggest that this pupil's efforts did not represent success. Given the parameters of success already discussed it undoubtedly was. Indeed the instructor pointed out that because the pupil had completed the abseil a second time, with less apparent emotional discomfort, this was further evidence of success. What is of concern however is the instructor's role in this success and whose success it was. An alternative explanation might suggest that what was being observed was the instructor's success in coaxing the pupil to the bottom as opposed to the pupil's success in achieving. Royce (1986: 16) makes a similar point suggesting of outdoor instructors that 'our motivation in this process may be that we seek to identify educational aims and objectives which satisfy our own understanding and support of our own egos and thus proceed to "justify" our curriculum programmes'.

This explanation suggests that success may be two dimensional, being determined on the one hand by the instructors ensuring that pupils complete an activity and on the other the experience of the pupils. In the case of the former there is an external element whereby the instructor is dictating the outcome. In the latter case the outcome is the internalised experience of the pupil. This is an important distinction for two reasons; first, the 5-14 (SOED, 1993c: 10) definition of self-esteem as 'the value which a person puts upon himself or herself', places the emphasis on the *individual's* experience; and second, the external control of experience is different from that which is experienced and each situation is based on different assumptions about learning.

Methods

The issue here is who controls the experience? Take for instance Entwistle's (1997: 3) claim that 'ultimately, each individual, has an interpretation of reality which is in some sense unique'. Where there is a dominant role for the instructor, as there was in the ropes course, the abseil and all activities which fit into Ruben's (1997) concept of narrow adventure, the instructor is excluded from the experience of the pupil. In this sense the instructor is also excluded from the pupil's reality because they assume the role of the expert and in so doing remove responsibility for learning from the learner. In this way the instructor becomes the purveyor of experiences and acts as a gatekeeper deciding on what constitutes education.

Instead Rogers (1983) like Entwistle (1997) begins with the pupil's understanding of the world. Rogers (1983: 25) suggests the role of the 'instructor (is) to understand them (pupils) as they (feel) and perceive themselves from the *inside*'. The difference between the internal experience of the pupil and the external influence of the instructor causes some problems for raising self-esteem through outdoor activities. Say, for example, a programme of outdoor education was to be delivered with the pupil's perceptions as the starting point. This programme could be guided by Roger's (1983: 33) ideas related to self-discovery and the search for personal identity which involve 'our choice of values, our stance in relation to parents and others, the relationship we choose to have to society...'. These can be related to everyday issues of self-esteem such as the clothes we wear, our hairstyle and appearance. From the definitions I have given it is clear that there is a strong correlation between the 5-14 definition of self-esteem (SOED, 1993c) and Roger's (1983) definition of self-discovery. To understand the connection between self-discovery and self-esteem the pupil would need to understand the link between the experiences gained in an outdoor activity and how it relates to their own values and relationships. At the heart of the matter is whether such experiences relate only to the context in which they are perceived or whether they translate into other contexts such as the home, school and wider community (Royce, 1987).

North American authors of outdoor education texts have addressed this by seeking to demonstrate that not only is this link possible but is *critical* to programme delivery (Bacon, 1983; Miles and Priest, 1990; Priest and Gass, 1997). In so doing they have promoted the concept of 'transfer learning' where 'the intent of the process pertains not only to the immediate activity, but also to the relation of the experience to future issues for the participant' (Gass, 1990: 199). United Kingdom texts (Hopkins and Putnam, 1993; Barrett and Greenaway, 1995; Keighley, 1998 and Cooper, 1998) tend not to use the term transfer learning although the concept is implicit.

The relationship between the pupil's experience, the instructor's role, and the transfer of experiences beyond the immediate context, raises important issues. The first is that if self-esteem is defined in the manner of Rogers (1983), Entwistle (1997) and the 5-14 (SOED, 1993c) guidelines, then, given the external role of the instructor, they are not knowingly engaged in raising self-esteem. It is possible that what passes for self-esteem may be more accurately termed excitement. This is not to deny that self-esteem and excitement may in some way be connected. It is to say, however, that the instructor remains excluded from the pupil's reality, which means they know little of the pupil's background, their values, or their relationships, which, according to Rogers (1983), are central to understanding self-esteem. All they know is what they see of the pupil for the five days that they visit the centre. They cannot therefore claim to be creating the experiences which are going to enhance pupil's self-esteem in relation to their own values, background and social relationships.

This leads to the second point. If the activities which are supposed to raise self-esteem have no direct bearing on established definitions (Rogers, 1983; Entwistle, 1997; SOED, 1993c) then the question needs to be asked of the relationship between methods, activities and outcomes. It would appear that in some cases activities and method are synonymous. This is to say that the instructors use the activity to mediate the experience. The abseil and ropes-course incidents are examples of this where it is the intensity of the experience that is being relied upon as an educational medium. This corresponds with findings from the pilot data and which secondary sources describe as the experience speaking for itself (Barrett and Greenaway, 1995; Priest and Gass, 1997). In such cases the role of the instructor is one of technician ensuring that the pupil participates in the activity to its completion in a safe manner. Where this is the case then there is a clear discrepancy between the aim of raising self-esteem, the method used to achieve that aim, and the instructor's understanding of the pupil's experiences.

To return to the original proposition that 'outdoor educators provide contexts and experiences to raise self-esteem', I must now challenge the belief that the inclusion of short-duration, high-excitement activities meets this aim. The problem with 'the experience speaking for itself' approach is that it implies a causal relationship between activity and experience. This is to say that there is a belief that participation in an activity leads to a series of predetermined outcomes. In this way the activity becomes the method and there is no educational role for the instructor. Likewise the pupil becomes a passive receptor. This creates a sterile situation where neither the instructor nor the pupil is taking responsibility for the learning process. There is also no recognition that the pupil's understanding of reality is the point of departure as Rogers (1983) and Entwistle (1997) have suggested. Instead this form of activity is foisted

upon the pupil without any intention of the pupil/instructor interaction necessary to begin addressing issues of self-esteem.

Here then is the crux of the argument. If the instructor adopts the role of 'technician' they tend to remove responsibility from the pupil. The pupil then does not have the chance to *experience* responsibility. In all cases where I observed high ropes courses and abseils, technical needs, such as making sure there was enough time for each pupil to complete the abseil, or getting back to the centre for supper, ensured that timetables and not outcomes drove these experiences. From this perspective it is apparent that either the activity or the aim needs to be changed since in these instances they are not compatible.

This brings into question the notion of transfer learning. The assumption underpinning transfer learning is that you remove a pupil from their everyday setting, relocate them in an unfamiliar one (the outdoors) and provide them with experiences which will be meaningfully transferred into their own environment. The outcome, and therefore the important point in this, is that the pupil must be able to utilise that experience in their own environment. If this is the ultimate aim then, given the concerns I have raised over the confusion between aims, methods and outcomes, one must ask if transfer is possible or indeed desirable. Research into Outward Bound and youth at risk is a case in point. Coalter (1988: 60) states 'if the post-outward bound circumstances do not support and reinforce new found self-esteem or if the social and economic circumstances of the adolescent do not change, then a return to delinquency may be inevitable'. The target group of this research and my own are different but the point remains clear, instructors have no understanding nor control over the post-residential experience.

The concept of transfer learning uses the outdoors as a mediating experience. Is there not a case therefore to deal with issues of self-esteem from the context of pupils' everyday lives where there is no need to transfer anything? Would this not negate the need for residential centres which are distant (geographically and conceptually) from pupils' everyday lives if the criterion is transfer learning. In short the evidence from residential outdoor education centres does not support secondary sources which claim transfer learning to be the critical issue in programmes. In passing I might add that it could be argued that the experiences of outdoor education are devalued when viewed within the context of transfer learning where it is implicit that their value is not fully realised until they are successfully transferred. If this reasoning is followed to its logical conclusion neither the outdoor activities nor the residential experience have much value in their own right. In this sense any claims relating to transfer learning should be seen as one side of a double-edged sword.

Claims

The difficulties that arise from the confusion between aims, methods, content and claims are closely related to the ability of instructors to measure and evaluate programmes. The first point to note is that no external research exists which has systematically set out to determine the extent to which five-day residential outdoor education programmes contribute to the self-esteem of primary pupils. By systematic I mean the adoption of acknowledged research instruments such as Rosenberg's (1989) self-esteem scale or other pre-existing methods which have already demonstrated inherent validity (e.g. Byrne, 1996). Although no context specific empirical research exists Barrett and Greenaway's (1995) review of literature and Cason and Gillis' (1994) meta-analysis, suggest self-esteem has attracted the most research attention in outdoor education programmes. This correlates with a large body of empirical research which, despite its variable quality (Barrett and Greenaway, 1995), is presented, in the form of another meta-analysis, as notable and with lasting effects (Hattie *et al.*, 1997: 77).

However, despite this weight of evidence it does not feature in the everyday world of the instructor. Data from the pilot showed the absence of links between the practice and empirical domains within residential outdoor education. This was found to be true throughout all five research sites where the reading of professional journals, texts, in-service training, conference and seminar attendance was not a feature of instructors' work. As such the body of research that does exist cannot be said to influence practice. Consequently, the practice of residential outdoor education tends not to be empirically driven.

To understand this non-empirical context it is necessary to juxtapose the aim of self-esteem with the claims instructors make in relation to measurement and evaluation. As far as self-esteem is concerned instructors rely on their own observations to assess whether their aims have been achieved. As I have shown, success in achieving the data items in proposition three (confidence, trying things, overcoming fear, developing self-belief, learning practical things and coping) are indicators which instructors look for in terms of self-esteem. For example, Stan used pupils' body language as an indicator of their self-esteem. Talking of a climbing session Paul said he was watching for 'confidence that they were able to climb it, confidence in the rope and trust in their partners...In one or two cases, clearly, I would be operating at self-esteem, to put some kind of value on their ability to do something...'. Chris observed 'when they thought they couldn't achieve certain things but they managed (this highlights) their capabilities and maybe that will raise their self-esteem'.

However, achievement is not necessarily a reliable indicator of self esteem. In some

situations there is evidence that instructors acquiesce to pupils' caprice, providing activities more for enjoyment than achievement. Talking of a day when his group were already timetabled to participate in two activities Iain responded to group demands to do another thus: 'the ropes course was sort of squeezed in, a bit hurried, but they wanted to do it because they see it and it is high profile...'. Giving pupils what they want is not necessarily based on educational motives and it is situations such as these that Royce (1987: 12) is referring to when he warns 'educational experiences need not necessarily be enjoyable...they have value over and above any particular acceptance or reaction of them'. He further states that 'enjoyable experiences do not necessarily make demands on thought processes...' (Royce, 1987: 12). Therefore, if self-esteem is determined (by the instructor) through the pupil completing an activity (achievement, coping, overcoming fear) and enjoying the experience (fun) then the two perhaps combine to create hedonism rather than education. At the heart of the matter is whether providing enjoyable and/or challenging experiences corresponds with the raising of self-esteem. Perhaps Maslow's (1954: 22) view that 'the fundamental or ultimate desires of all human beings do not differ nearly as much as do their conscious everyday desires' is a case in point. If, as Maslow is suggesting, there is a difference between the superficiality of 'everyday desires' and something more permanent and common to all human beings then it is possible that the excitement of pupils reflects the superficial at the expense of something deeper.

I am not suggesting that education cannot and should not be fun. In this I follow Dewey (1963: 27) who states learning experiences should be 'more than immediately enjoyable (in order to) promote having desirable future experiences'. Accepting therefore that education can be fun and enjoyable the question remains: 'in what way does the fun and enjoyment of outdoor activities lead to desirable future experiences?' This point remains unresolved.

I do not want to stretch this point too far but there are certain trends developing in residential outdoor education which do not augur well for the promotion of educational experiences. All five centre principals agreed that there are increasing financial pressures being placed on their operations. This is in keeping with survey findings of all 109 local authority residential outdoor centres in England (Taverner, 1994). The Scottish local authority education and community education departments have applied pressure on their centres in different ways but there are common themes. The first of these is the emergence of 'the client', meaning pupils, schools or school teachers. The nomenclature is important because allied to the terminology is the view that pupils are paying customers which implies a particular type of inherent contract.

One principal (Ladhar Bheinn) suggested that as paying customers pupils are entitled

to what they want. Therefore, the potential exists for pupils and visiting teachers to choose the activities that they will enjoy which does not necessarily address Royce's (1987) concerns about the nature and purpose of education. The same principal recounted an example where one group was pursuing an activity and came across another group who they perceived to be involved in something more exciting. The principal's view was that this should not be allowed to happen, in other words pupils' superficial desires should be attended to. At this point I recorded in my fieldwork diary 'if personal and social development represents the paramount aim of outdoor education surely pupils should be confronted with their self-image of I want, I want'. What is happening here is that the desire to please is in opposition to an espoused aim.

A similar issue is the introduction of a new activity to this centre (Ladhar Bheinn) where the prime concern, in the principal's words, was 'to gain competitive advantage'. Activities were introduced and chosen on the basis of what the market will bear in relation to what the clients want or will tolerate. In short, activities and experiences are not necessarily chosen to meet the stated aim of raising self-esteem.

Perhaps the most explicit testimony comes from Sammy who, when referring to a particular activity (the activity will remain undisclosed to maintain anonymity) he thought had low educational value, stated 'this is quite a competitive market and if you don't give the pupils a good time, something that is enjoyable, then it is unlikely that they are going to come back again, and bear in mind that each of these kids, or their families will have paid in the region of £140 to come, then it is a buyers market so that's what we have to provide.'

This financial expediency has other manifestations. For example, Carn An Fhithleir's principal suggested that costs are limiting the range of activities the centre can afford to offer. The numbers in each individual group have gone up (Ladhar Bheinn). Beinn Dearg is taking more groups than before. Carn An Fhithleir also reports greater numbers passing through the centre. Consequently, the ratios between instructor and pupil are less favourable for individual attention.

Another development is the growing importance attached to assistant instructor training schemes (four of the five centres operate them) where apprentices are employed on either a food and accommodation basis and/or a lower income than permanent instructors. There is evidence to suggest that these are motivated by other than educational reasons. For example, Iain stated 'there is a danger (in) depending on short term associate staff (who might be) very highly competent, very motivated pursuit wise...'. Sammy confirmed this position stating 'associate staff...tend to be sportsmen first and teachers second'. Ladhar Bheinn's principal stated 'there isn't an unlimited

pool of people and at certain times of the year we end up being forced to employ people that we are not entirely happy with because there isn't anybody else'. Furthermore, 'they don't necessarily have the caring attitude or the educational imperative that I would like them to have'. The principal of An Teallach freely admitted that the schemes are driven by financial concerns rather than educational ones.

What is happening here is that centres are increasingly looking towards pleasing their customers, who are seen as a financial investment, at the risk of compromising educational quality. At the same time the financial imperative that has reduced instructor/pupil ratios has increased the dependency on associate staff whose interests are not, in the first instance, educational. Since there is no external monitoring of educational standards there is no overview of educational quality from one centre to the next.

One further aspect of educational quality needs to be considered. The pressure on staff time is such that increasingly there is less time for instructors to visit schools prior to the schools residential visit to the centre. School visits by instructors were designed to provide a link between centre and school staff allowing the opportunity, amongst other things, to decide on curricular links. Without this visit pupils arrive at the centres forewarned (by post) only about technical information (e.g. what clothes to take).

Despite these financial pressures outdoor education centres remain popular. All operate an advance booking system with Beinn Dearg and Lochnagar being fully booked two years in advance. It is perhaps this type of success that shields outdoor centres from the empirical world. When I asked the principal of Ladhar Bheinn to comment on means of evaluation he thought that 'from an operational view it is unimportant to measure impact because the service we are providing is valued and I know that people want to come back...'. This means that not only does residential education proceed in an empirical vacuum but the momentum maintained through repeat visits acts as the prime evaluative mechanism by which the success of programmes is monitored. Consequently the evaluative mechanism is external with no regard for the internal experiences of the pupil.

If evaluation were to happen Nichols (1994: 11) suggests that instructors must ask of themselves:

1. Why you want to evaluate?
2. What are you trying to evaluate?
3. How is it going to be done?

Nichols (1994) further suggests that question one is subdivided into three categories.

The first is 'proving' where the purpose is to demonstrate worth to external sources and this most accurately identifies with the current focus of outdoor centres. The second is 'improving' which is concerned with the abilities of the instructor which, as I have demonstrated elsewhere, is not reflected in staff training programmes (Nicol, 1999). The third category is to do with the 'learning' of the pupil which in this instance is not systematically attempted. For example, after one activity, Jamie asked his group if they would like to do a hillwalk again in the future. All said 'yes'. He then asked each individual, 'what did you enjoy most and what did you find most difficult?' The pupils' responses are unimportant in this context, what is important is the unsophisticated means which pass for evaluation.

Question two asks 'what are you trying to evaluate?' It raises intriguing questions since the various indicators of self-esteem in this data set (confidence, trying things, achievement, overcoming fear, developing self-belief, learning practical things and coping) to more detailed definitions (Donaldson, 1978; Rogers, 1983; Entwistle, 1997) provide no stable foundation from which to ask this question. What is lacking are objectively valid criteria for success which link the outdoor activity to self-esteem. Without this sort of foundation and without stated criteria, as Nichols (1994) observes, question three cannot be addressed.

Summary of Proposition Three

As I have stated at the beginning of this chapter the personal and social development document (SOED, 1993c: 10) states, 'self-esteem refers to the value which a person puts upon himself or herself. Pupils have high self-esteem when they feel good about themselves and their achievements'. It is this aspect of personal and social development which Cason and Gillis (1994) and Barrett and Greenaway (1995) identify as the the most frequently cited psychological outcome of outdoor education programmes. As far as instructor testimony is concerned this claim is borne out by the evidence in this chapter. There is a resoluteness in this testimony that has led me to suggest that it is a substantive aim.

Underpinning this aim is the assumption that outdoor activities can effectively raise self-esteem through personal achievement and by successfully completing outdoor activities. Activities can be either emotional or physical. In activities where there is a high excitement (emotional) challenge there is a belief that self-esteem is raised by overcoming fear and challenges. Where activities are more prolonged such as a hillwalk, self-esteem is believed to be raised through the feeling of achievement (physical). However, it is not uncommon for success and achievement to be defined by the instructor so as, from the pupil's point of view, the experience is externally conditioned and may well foster instructor dependency. In such cases the pupil does

not have control of their learning experience which raises questions about learning assumptions such as, 'is it the instructor's role to teach or the learners to learn?'

This situation has been allowed to develop as the practice of residential outdoor education takes place in an empirical vacuum. Instructors do not have to hand tried and tested means of measurement and evaluation. Consequently, instructors rely on their own observations and interpretations of the data items of proposition three (confidence, trying things, achievement, overcoming fear, developing self-belief, learning practical things and coping) to determine levels of pupils' self-esteem.

Financial issues represent a threat to the way in which centre staff think about educational processes. Larger group sizes, more groups per visit, higher instructor/pupil ratios and the increasing use of assistant instructor schemes combine to challenge educational quality. However, the ultimate question is 'quality of what?' Because places at outdoor centres are in high demand there is a feeling that there is no need to evaluate pupils' experiences. In this manner continual demand becomes synonymous with educational quality which may well be at the expense of what the pupils are actually learning.

The purpose of this chapter was to explore the term 'self-esteem'. Just as Chapter Six sought to determine 'in what sense personal and social development relates to environmental education', this chapter was focussing on the self-esteem aspect of personal and social development. Like Chapter Six I had been following Cooper's (1991) reasoning that environmental education is inseparable from personal and social (development). The data presented in this chapter challenges this view. The weight of evidence suggests that raising the self-esteem of pupils represents the most important claim that outdoor educators make and the focus that instructors spend the majority of their time working towards. Beginning with simple analysis, if, by their own testimony, instructors spend the majority of their time working on issues of self-esteem then logic dictates that only a minority of their time is spent on environmental education. My own observation and interview texts support this claim in that there is no conscious attempt by the instructors to introduce environmental education during any of the activities used to develop self-esteem. As in Chapters Five and Six the only visible manifestation of this was the odd inclusion of countryside interpretation or aspects of the 'Country Code'.

Viewed in this manner it is not possible to concur with Cooper (1991) that environmental education is inseparable from personal and social (development). They are separable because instructors consciously separate and prioritise them to the point that self-esteem is a more important aim than environmental education. In terms of the

framework developed in Chapter Five I can conclude that, as far as instructors are concerned, self-esteem is an example of a 'substantive' aim whereas environmental education would be either 'intended' or 'consequential' depending on and varying from one instructor to another.

SELF-AWARENESS

The 5-14 document (SOED, 1993c) recognises a strong connection between self-esteem and self-awareness since they both relate to the personal aspect of personal and social development. In the last proposition I showed that the evaluation of self-esteem depended largely on the instructors' interpretation of how much the pupils enjoyed their week. However, if happy faces, or good feelings, are the only criteria by which this is measured there are consequences. For example, it is possible to argue that someone may enjoy breaking into and stealing cars with a consequential raising of self-esteem. The important question therefore is not whether self-esteem is being raised but the values context in which actions attributed to self-esteem are considered. Where the hedonistic aspect of self-esteem is allowed to dominate without cognisance of this context the situation arises (as reported in the last proposition) where pupils are not confronted with selfish desires, nor are they required to consider the consequences of their actions.

In other words, if aims relating to personal and social development are to extend beyond superficiality and everyday desires (Maslow, 1954) there are times when pupils cannot simply do as they wish. Pupils may, by instinct or preference, want to pursue their own desires but there will be opportunities where instructors can use these desires as a baseline to explore the pupils' inner world in relation to their perceptions of the outer. The way that instructors operationalise the concept of self-esteem might therefore get in the way of developing self-awareness in pupils. An example from the wider social sphere serves to illustrate this point. If, for example, self-esteem is the sole indicator, the theft of cars could be seen as contributing to what the 5-14 document describes as 'the development of positive self-image' (SOED, 1993c: 10). This is to say that the act of theft could lead to the raising of self-esteem. Thus it can be seen how our education system adopts the view that certain aspects of self-image are more acceptable than others. This dilemma has traditionally been the domain of moral philosophy with Hepburn (1968: 98) asking 'how can we reliably make *any* judgment about right and wrong, good or bad?'

Thus self-awareness becomes a higher order aim concerned with how 'actions are influenced by values, attitudes and past experiences' (SOED, 1993c: 8). Furthermore, through a process of reflection pupils may engage in self-assessment to become aware of their own values. In this way pupils become equipped to take decisions and make choices in applying this knowledge in future situations (SOED, 1993c). Self-esteem is, therefore, to do with feelings embodied in the statement that 'pupils have high self-

esteem when they feel good about themselves and their achievements’ (SOED, 1993c: 10). On the other hand self-awareness has a values and action context (SOED, 1993c).

Although only 5 of the 14 instructors mentioned ‘self-awareness’ explicitly, it is clear from the following data items, taken from interview responses, that they are linked to the PSD definition. Consequently, these data items are categorised within proposition four.

Proposition Four
Outdoor educators provide contexts and experiences to promote self-awareness
The numbers appended to each data item are used in the same manner as Chapters Six and Seven. To explore the validity of this proposition I will be using the same five point framework of analysis as in Chapter Seven (aims, assumptions, content, methods and claims).

Data Items	Score
Broaden experience of life’s opportunities	3
The opportunity for self expression	2
To recognise strengths and weaknesses as individuals	1
Being on their own without the family influence	1
Ability to evaluate performance of self	1
Understanding of other peoples’ requirements	2
Encourage the belief that you can make a difference to others	2
Encourage tolerance of others	1
Confidence in fellow pupils	1
Trust in fellow pupils	1

Aims
The *PSD* document (SOED, 1993c) provides a ready made categorisation for aims related to personal and social development in residential outdoor education. Where it is considerably weaker is in clarifying and defining terms. For example, the statement that self-awareness has a values context means little unless there is common understanding as to the meaning of values. This has all the more urgency since, for Carr (1999: 296), it is a self-evident truth that education is ‘but a matter of communicating values’. For Carr this pleonasm is extended to morality so that education, values and morals become an inseparable entity. Definitions therefore are central to understanding the data items attached to self-awareness.

Relationships express different forms of values. Posch (1993: 27) describes these in terms of a continuum where, at one end, values are the personal preferences of one person, whilst at the other, there are what he calls 'basic values'. This is not a pejorative use of the term so much as an indication that certain values are foundational in society. In this sense he posits a values hierarchy distinguishing between personal and social values. Posch (1993) cites 'justice' as an example of the latter and it is alongside values of this metaphysical order that Carr's (1999) ideas of morality fit. Insofar as morals are about how to behave, judging people and calling an action right or wrong (Warnock, 1967), this definition of morality links values to the data items. Hence the data item 'broaden experience of life's opportunities' presents the instructor with the opportunity to explore firstly, what life's opportunities are; second, who these opportunities are for; and third how they are accessed. Similarly 'being on their own without the family influence' implies that there are benefits from doing this. In this way issues of independence from and dependence on the family become ways in which to explore the pupil's world.

At the heart of these definitional issues is the classical metaphysical separation of free-will and determinism. Teichman and Evans (1995: 37) define the difference where 'freedom of the will means freedom to make choices (whereas) the denial of free will is determinism, the theory that no individual has any control over his or her actions'. Thus it can be deduced that values and morality have a close correspondence, and that the means of expressing one's values is through actions. Self-awareness therefore represents an opportunity for instructors to explore the nature of pupils' choices (based on their own desires) in relation to the mediating influence of societal values.

Assumptions

From the data set attached to proposition four above I would suggest that instructors and principals are operating on the basis of four assumptions:

1. Self-awareness arises out of participation in outdoor education programmes
2. This aim requires the clarification of values through a process of action and reflection
3. Being self-aware acknowledges the extent to which the individual has the power to act
4. This understanding of self allows the individual to contribute to the growth of society.

These four assumptions represent a progression from the pupil's inner reality to their outer. By extending pupil's understanding Donaldson (1978) warns that there will be

moments of incongruity where their inner perception of the outer world appears to be challenged by new experiences which will in turn conflict with their inner reality. These moments should not be avoided. Quite the contrary, it is moments such as these that Donaldson suggests form the basis of valid educational experience. Furthermore, it is from such conflict that personal growth occurs. In her own words 'education should aim to encourage the readiness to come to grips with incongruity and even to seek it out in a positive fashion...' (Donaldson, 1978: 112).

Content

From 112 hours of observations covering five centres and fourteen instructors there were only two separate occasions where these observations supported the interview testimony of the validity of this aim. The first I have already explained in Chapter Five and for ease of reference I will restate the incident here. In this instance the activity was hillwalking and the instructor Chris. On gaining the summit we stopped for lunch and since it was raining Chris produced a Zarsky sack. During lunch Chris initiated an informal review session. I recorded in my field notes that the review included:

personal performances on the way up. The whole group expressed their enjoyment of the trip even though they have had to work hard. Everybody says they would do it again. They talk about physics, that Muslims believe in different things than Christians and have different festivals and special days. One pupil suggested that he hated all Japanese because his favourite wrestler got beaten by a Japanese wrestler which led into a discussion about racism and nationalism, all led by Chris.

This was a 30 minute interactive discussion skilfully led and including all pupils. It seemed to incorporate the very essence of self-awareness from the very general social issues surrounding religion to the very personal issue of why some people come to hate others. Chris led the discussion so as this individual's peers could help him to arrive at the source of his own values. There was also recognition that this pupil had the power to think differently, a point brought to life when Chris posed the question 'how would you react on meeting a Japanese person who until, that time, was a stranger?' This is a precise example of the incongruity which Donaldson (1978) referred to where the pupil's inner world was being challenged by new experiences.

The second occasion also happened during a hillwalk. Like Chris' example the group had stopped for a break and were resting. On this occasion, however, the weather conditions were such as to allow a panoramic view of a mountain range. For reasons of anonymity I cannot name the mountains but the issue arose when the instructor pointed out a development site. Using this as an opportunity to explore conflicting opinions (development versus conservation) the instructor asked the pupils their views. All eight pupils felt the development should not go ahead. Further probing from the

instructor found that the overwhelming reason ‘against’ was based on aesthetic considerations. The instructor was then able to discuss the importance of jobs to the local economy and how some local people would prefer work even if it meant scenic loss, whilst other people might favour the scenery at the expense of jobs. In this way the pupils could explore the stake-holders in decision making and the difficulties associated with making informed choices. Afterwards, I reflected it would have been interesting if the pupils had been asked to vote again in the light of their new knowledge.

A third example was posited by Michael who was talking hypothetically. Despite this I have included it as an example of intent, if not fact. He suggested that one of his aims is to encourage pupils to think of behaviour not as a set of rules but to think of their own actions in relation to how others perceive them. Thus people who ‘act macho’ are asked to consider this from their peers perspective introducing, amongst other things, gender issues. This idea corresponds with the aim of self-awareness, particularly in relation to assumption two where ‘this aim requires the clarification of values through a process of action and reflection’. Given the findings related to this assumption it follows that assumption one ‘self-awareness arises out of participation in outdoor education programmes’ has some validity. Indeed all of those interviewed offered examples of their work which, whilst they remain hypothetical, provide a clear indication that this is the realm in which instructors *believe* they are operating.

What these assumptions do is to provide a means of distinguishing between instructors talking hypothetically as opposed to demonstrating aims in action. I have purposely ordered the assumptions from one to four to show an increasing level of claim. In this way it is possible to show the enormous diversity and magnitude of aims consistent with self-awareness. These range from Paul’s statement, ‘in some weeks (the pupils cannot) tie their shoe lace and it’s at that level, and everybody (the other pupils) know they can so when they get back to school and they say ‘oh, dress me’, the kids in their group will turn around and say ‘no, you did it at Beinn Dearg...’. Paul is using this simple task not in a functional sense (to get dressed) but as a means of expressing to the pupil that they themselves have the power to act. At the other end of the scale are claims such as Ladhar Bheinn’s principal who suggested that for some people their week at the centre will be ‘a life changing experience’.

A second issue that this evidence raises is that the closer the claims are towards the higher numbered assumptions the further they become detached from the immediate context. Take, for example, assumption three ‘being self-aware acknowledges the extent to which the individual has the power to act’, and juxtapose it with the data item ‘trust in fellow pupils’ (an item referred to by all 14 instructors). The power to act was

seen as pupils helping each other over obstacles or being considerate to each other. Tim further states 'they've been able to express themselves in a manner in which they haven't done before'. Now the simple fact is that Tim does not know the pupils' history. He has no idea what pupils were like before, yet he makes assertions that implies he does. Similarly, Ladhar Bheinn's principal's claim rests on the realisation of pupils' experience beyond that of the immediate. In both cases respondents are referring to dimensions of time (past, Tim; and future, Ladhar Bheinn's principal) about which they can only speculate.

This raises a third issue concerning validity in relation to hypothetical data, particularly where the claim being made differs from the context in which the delivery took place. These varying examples represent confusing testimony as to the nature of empowerment. This is not to say that self-awareness is not being raised. However, if self-awareness of this magnitude is to be a legitimate aim of outdoor education then it seems reasonable that instructors would know the limits of the claims they can make. This is even more the case with the next assumption which is even grander in scale.

Assumption four states: 'this understanding of self allows the individual to contribute to the growth of society'. Assumptions one and two are, in a sense, self-contained which means that the instructor can deal with them within the scheduled five-day programme. The problem with assumptions three and four is that they become increasingly distant from the immediate context in which they are considered. They depend on variables outwith the understanding and control of instructors, a point made in Chapter Seven in relation to self-esteem. There is no way of instructors knowing if any of these pupils are empowered to act beyond the context of the five-day programme. Nor can it be determined the extent to which any new found self-awareness can contribute to the growth of society. What the data items help to show is that by making explicit the assumptions which underpin them there is a lot to remain circumspect about.

Methods

As I have shown in the 'content' section above there are only two valid examples from my data showing a correspondence between the adopted definition of self-awareness and instructor practice. Common to both examples is that they took place during hillwalking and involved a discussion of some sort. They may be separated further in that one discussion was location dependent (the mountain development) whilst the other was group dependent (arising out of issues particular to that group at that time). In a location dependent situation the instructor can manufacture the experience by taking the group to the same vantage point with the explicit aim of discussing the issue. For the latter the instructor has to be more responsive to the changing nature of group

dynamics. However, there is nothing unique about the instructor being responsive to group dynamics as logic suggests every school teacher is confronted with these situations on a regular basis.

The significance of the former is its location specificity. This is not to say that pupils cannot be encouraged to develop self-awareness in relation to values and choices without leaving the classroom. However, when I asked instructors how outdoor education could contribute in a way that school teachers could not, Sammy replied, 'it is an environment one step removed from what they (the pupils) are used to. It gives the opportunity to analyse basic assumptions'. The place in which outdoor education is conducted therefore may be seen as one of its strengths where pupils are confronted with first-hand sources to stimulate thinking and feeling. This may simply be another, more direct, way of knowing about an issue (as opposed to reading about it in a book) or as Sammy suggested a completely different context for the pupils to think about themselves and what is important to them. This corresponds with the discussion in Chapter Two where the immediacy of this experiential approach brings advantages not evident in class-based learning.

It is significant that the two examples took place during a non-technical, low excitement activity (compared to abseiling or high ropes). Iain remarked, 'the problem...is you don't really know with the hillwalk where the conversation is going to lead, it could be anything from the war in Europe to drugs...you have got to be prepared and armed to deal with anything that comes your way'. As such this approach is rather serendipitous arising out of moments dictated by the dynamics of the group. This calls into question the nature of curricular content and the role of the instructor in arbitrating between serendipitous moments and planned aims. An example of one view is apparent in the following interview dialogue. I had been asking Iain how he defined certain aspects of outdoor education.

Iain: I think outdoor education is just education in the outdoors and it's not necessarily rockclimbing. It is rockclimbing, but it's not necessarily pure pursuits, that's my outlook on it.

RN: So if it's not rock climbing then what is it?

Iain: It's education outdoors.

RN: So what are people learning?

Iain: Anything you decide you want them to learn.

RN: So you're the walking curriculum?

Iain: Yes I am it.

Iain's testimony represents an important departure from the weight of instructor and principal testimony which seeks to argue for outdoor education to be included alongside school curricular guidelines. If it is part of curricular guidelines then it is bounded by certain conventions such as 'rationale', 'content', 'outcomes' and 'assessment' (SOED, 1993c). If it is not then it might be seen as what the Lochnagar principal described as 'enrichment education' adopting a more supportive but nevertheless external role. Despite the tendency to defend outdoor education by aligning it to the 5-14 guidelines (SOED, 1993c) Iain was arguing for freedom from these guidelines. It is this freedom that allowed Iain and Chris the opportunity to respond to pupils in the way I have described.

Because discussion is central to this method, it makes sense that an activity that is conducive to discussion is where raising self-awareness will take place. I do not want to generalise extensively to exclude certain activities because instructors can always create opportunities to cater for discussion. However, activities such as kayaking, climbing, abseiling and high ropes are all either excitement led or require a degree of concentration on technical elements. Such activities require greater intervention on the instructors' part in order to cultivate appropriate moments. This differs in both structure and content from issues which arise more naturally and are often pupil led during hillwalking. These issues of content and structure can be overcome with a little creativity on the part of the instructor but, as was the case with self-esteem, the focus on activities often seems to get in the way of a consistent approach to self-awareness throughout the range of activities. Alternatively, the question needs to be asked, if self-awareness is the aim then in what way does the activity serve this aim? Furthermore, if certain activities are not seen as consistent with the aims they are supposed to achieve then why are they in the programme? For the moment, however, this debate is not taking place and there is no evidence that it will be forthcoming.

The final point is that many of the claims relating to the higher order assumptions are unconditional. By this I mean that there is an expectation that aims will be achieved through unmediated experience. For example, the principal of Lochnagar said what 'we're doing is maybe challenging some of the existing values...and maybe questioning how people want to live their lives...'. This statement assumes one of two positions; either, the experience of being at an outdoor centre will lead the pupils, on their own initiative, to consider these worldly issues. Alternatively, for the experience to make sense, it has to be mediated by the instructor. The two examples given above

are indicative of mediated experience. However, it would appear that the greatest tendency is for instructors and principals to rely on unmediated experience.

An example of this occurred as I was pursuing a particular line of questioning with the principal at Beinn Dearg. We had got to the point where I summarised thus: 'so it is inescapable that personal and social education takes place regardless of any other stated objective?' to which the principal replied 'yes'. Although not referring specifically to self-awareness I use the evidence to show the ease with which the distinct and separate claims within the panoply of personal and social development become obscured under this umbrella term. In this instance the principal said that it is the 'intensity' of the experience that is the critical aspect. Similarly, the principal at Carn an Fhìdhleir suggested 'the opportunities for learning about themselves here are greater because of the nature of the environment that we are using (and) the inherent challenges of being out, in the rain, out pushing yourself, maybe up a hill...'. These statements are indications that staff are willing to accept the experience speaks for itself and where this is the case, as in self-esteem (Chapter Seven), participation becomes the method.

However, Dewey (1963: 27) states:

the quality of any experience has two aspects. There is an immediate aspect of agreeableness or disagreeableness, and there is its influences on later experiences. The first is obvious and easy to judge. The *effect* of an experience is not borne on its face. It sets a problem to the educator.

If this statement is accepted then it causes problems for instructors. Whilst the 'agreeable' aspect of this is evident in the way pupils enjoy outdoor activities (as was the case in Chapter Seven with self-esteem), there are only two examples of instructors developing that experience into further experiences. Other than these examples, instructors are not using the initial experience as a 'problem'. Instead the experience is used as a one-off, stand alone and uninterpreted existential moment.

Claims

As I imply above, claims relating to self-awareness may be ordered into two distinct categories, those which are restricted to the immediate context and confined by the length of visit, and those which extend beyond that week. The key determinant in both is the role of the instructor. Explaining the sequencing of activities in a week long programme Henry offered one example which typifies the former where 'the aim of the week is to get them to communicate with and respect each other'. In such cases the locus of control remains the interface between the pupil and instructor and the experience is limited to the one week stay. The further removed from this interface the more elusive the claims appear to be.

The most elusive example (which could also be described as an overstatement) is Stan's claim that outdoor education was like forensic science, 'every time you touch something you leave something behind, (the instructor must) ensure that the effect is positive (because) any effect on them (the pupils) will have an effect on somebody else... You send a whole ripple through society'. This statement could easily be dismissed as an isolated metaphoric story. However, it is restated in different ways on six occasions throughout the interview where positive outcomes of an outdoor education programme are linked to societal benefits. This corresponds very closely with the respected Dartington conference statement (see Hopkins and Putnam, 1993) that outdoor education provides a context 'wherein the individual's personal development is involved with practical responsibilities both to a group and to society at large' (Dartington, 1975: appendix C17).

However, one must remain cautious of such claims in the light of empirical evidence which found methodological inadequacies in synthesising the outcomes of programmes of different length, type of activities, size of groups and the qualifications and nature of group leaders (Cason and Gillis, 1994). Claims must therefore be context specific and if Stan's was the most excessive claim, by far the majority fell somewhere between Henry and Stan's positions. This became apparent as I asked if the benefits of an outdoor education programme were limited to the week in question. All remaining instructors (12) and five principals believed benefits do extend to include some positive influence made by the pupil in relation to their family, school or local community. Despite the suspicion Cason and Gillis have of claims such as Stan's, the belief remained at my own sites that benefits beyond the programme did occur. The 'family, school or local community' are all societal components, so despite wanting on the one hand to distance themselves from the sort of claim made by Stan, they are, in fact, supporting it. At this point I was not sure if the anomaly was due to differing perceptions about the nature of society or an inability to articulate achievable claims.

I tried to force this issue by asking instructors if they believed there was a permanence to what pupils learnt. Michael replied he 'would be very surprised if there's not'. Henry said 'some of the stuff they've done here will be remembered and the impact will be great...'. Iain thought 'we have to assume that they are learning'. Paul shared these beliefs but added the caveat, 'I think we need to structure some of the work'. When pushed as to what these benefits or impacts might be there was a tendency for instructors to respond in one of four ways offering:

1. hypothetical examples
2. the testimony of school teachers
3. anecdotal evidence from their own childhood experiences
4. the testimony of past pupils and their memories of outdoor centres.

The reason for the elusiveness is quite clear. Jamie stated 'I think there can be (permanence) but for the majority of children who leave here, who we don't see again, there is no way of actually assessing that'. Consequently, just as in Chapter Seven, there was a lack of evidence relating to evaluative mechanisms when referring to self-esteem, so too in regard to self-awareness. This raises significant problems in understanding residential outdoor education. Despite trying to separate out the distinct claims in order to analyse their validity, instructors increasingly want to talk generally. This is most apparent when discussing the nature of claims in relation to evaluation. In what follows therefore I cannot attach validity to either self-esteem nor self-awareness so much as present data that represents instructors' views on personal and social development in general. This vagueness may be frustrating but it nevertheless represents a major aspect of instructors' reality, particularly as Jamie's view is not an isolated case. The consistency with which instructors tend to generalise therefore becomes an aspect of *their* reality which deserves analysis.

The focus of this generalisation becomes more apparent when centre staff are asked to talk about measurement, assessment and evaluation. Michael said, 'we don't have any way of quantifying what we do', and Henry added, 'I don't think you can measure it'. Jamie stated, 'there is no formal or informal way (to evaluate)', whilst Tim agreed with Michael that 'it's hard to quantify'. Jamie said evaluation is a 'gut feeling' and Iain agreed suggesting further that what currently goes for evaluation is 'unscientific'. Sammy stated that outdoor education is 'subjective and unmeasurable'. Michael took a more creative stance suggesting 'you have got to tell them (pupils) what they have achieved'. Finally, Iain suggested 'we can't test it...their teachers might be able to...back at school'.

To develop another angle on this I asked all the principals to consider the situation where the local authority accountants department have threatened the centre with closure unless the principal could demonstrate that the outdoor centre represented value for money. I then asked, 'how would you respond in terms of evidence?' (this statement and question is paraphrased). All five principals suggested that the evidence would have to come from school teachers. The principal of Carn an Fhithleir highlighted this dependence stating 'we rely on teachers for evaluation'.

Lochnagar's principal did suggest, however, that 'it is possible to measure (through) qualitative measurement' and the evaluative mechanism he refers to includes the sort of performance criteria used in drama and dance. Despite the recognition that evaluation is possible there remains a lack of evidence of this being put into practice. This is perhaps best understood in light of Ladhar Bheinn's principal who, when referring to evaluation, said, 'I don't know from an operational point of view there is much

advantage. I know that the service we are providing is valued and I know that people want to come back'. It should be remembered, however, that the logistics of wholesale evaluation of psychological testing on a regular basis is one of scale. With anything from 48 (Beinn Dearg) to 100 (Carn an Fhithleir) pupils per week the time for data collection and analysis would, according to principals (Beinn Dearg and Ladhar Bheinn), be prohibitive.

If instructors and principals absolve themselves of assessment and evaluation responsibility it should not be assumed that they are insensitive to their own performance. Beinn Dearg's principal said 'the most productive feedback we get (comes) from visiting (school) staff'. Miller said 'the achievement they (the school teachers) can sometimes see is when they (the children) go back to school'. Geraldine suggested 'instructors don't see what pupils learn here and we would need to ask the teachers because they see...'. Chris said 'I think the (school teachers are the) people that actually see what goes on with the groups and definitely believe there are benefits, no matter how hard it is to quantify...'.

The Missing Link

Given that instructors devolve evaluation responsibilities to school teachers there are two perspectives which compliment each other in explaining how this has come about. The first is the instructors' explanation of what they say the teachers say, and the second is what the teachers say themselves. An example of the former is the following extract where Miller is referring to a previous conversation with a school teacher.

She probably had them pretty well sussed before she arrived here but they saw her in a different light and she was able to work with them in a different way, the way she would have liked to work with them in school while she was here. When she went back, she was able to continue working in a much more friendly way in school and from children who were literally disciplined all the time, they were not disciplined, they self-disciplined.

Similarly, Paul stated, 'some of the children (the teachers say) are out of their shells completely here, they see a completely different side of their character'. It is interesting to note that although the teachers may see a different side of their character it does not follow that any *change* of character has occurred. It is possible that if the teacher saw the pupils in any out-of-class setting they might well notice similar effects. However, these statements are one step removed from the teachers' own testimonies and are therefore one step removed from the validity of teachers' claims. In order to check this data I asked 14 visiting school teachers what they saw as the value of outdoor education programmes. Without exception the responses were positive and they corresponded very closely with the instructors testimony. Common to all was the observation that

pupils' classroom behaviour improved immediately after the outdoor experience. Twelve of the fourteen were teachers who had previous experience of the respective centres at which I interviewed them and so their testimony had both historical and contemporary relevance. By this I mean they were referring not to the cohort of pupils I observed, but those they accompanied in the past. This historical aspect is important because if they had had to comment on the current group they would not have been able to describe the differences in the classroom as they had not yet returned. These are teachers who knew previous cohorts before they went to the centre, who followed their progress at the centre and then saw the change afterwards. In this sense school teachers are the common denominator representing an informal pre- and post-test mechanism and the only source of continuity in this whole process.

The testimony of school teachers is a reminder of the missing link within residential outdoor education. Given their overview of this process their testimony adds a distinct dimension to understanding the aims and associated claims. However, their very positive testimony (replicating the instructors') does not support my own analysis which, throughout the current chapter (as well as Chapters Six and Seven), can be summarised generally in that the propositional claims lack a valid conception of practice and evaluation. The clue to this disparity lies not in what the instructors say they are achieving but in something that is generally taken for granted. I asked all instructors what they thought was unique about an outdoor centre. Iain's response was typical, suggesting it is about 'personal attention, small groups (and) somebody who cares about them (the pupils)'.

Carn an Fhìdhleir's principal stated that 'the relationship between the instructors and the group is an essential part of allowing individuals to feel confident at rising to challenges...mutual regard for each other...'. He went one step further stating 'it is the professionals that are the defining part of what we do...'. What is being described here is the way the pupils are treated and not what is to be achieved by them. When I asked the same question of school teachers one deputy head was so convinced of the benefits that she told me she always tries to book in September because that builds up a relationship with the class teacher and pupils at the beginning of the year.

At this point I began to wonder if the whole justification of claims related to outdoor education were based on misplaced assumptions. Paradoxically the reason that made me question this in the first place was the consistency, power and replication of testimony from instructors, principals and teachers that aims were being met. Although all three groupings were happy to put the changes down to personal and social development nobody, at any stage, could demonstrate what aspect of personal development (teamwork, self-esteem, self-awareness, or anything else) was responsible,

nor could they tell me *why* pupils behaviour appeared to improve in class after a residential experience. Further confusion is added when considering Simpson's (1992) empirical findings (which focused on visiting teachers at residential centres) where there was little evidence of benefits accruing to the school based curriculum.

However, there is a common denominator throughout this phenomenon. Subject to all instructor, principal and school teacher testimony and linking the pupils' pre- and post-outdoor centre experience, is the concept of relationships. This point is critical because the weight of research in outdoor education has been outcome based focussing on, for example, self-esteem and self-awareness (Cason and Gillis, 1994; Barrett and Greenaway, 1995; Neill and Richards, 1998). Less attention has been paid to the interaction of social actors, the very essence of which finds justification in the PSD (SOED, 1993c: 12) document that 'good personal relationships are an end in themselves'. I am referring not to the task orientated inter-pupil relationships central to Adair's (1987) ideas about teambuilding. Instead I am suggesting that one of the most important aspects of outdoor education (the interface between first, the pupil and the instructor, and also, the pupil and the school teacher) has been neglected by researchers in the pursuit of, and belief in, quantitative outcome based evidence. Instructors, who are in any case working in isolation from this evidence, have developed forms of practice based on a 'feelgood factor' that they too readily identify with teamwork, self-esteem and self-awareness.

From this two conclusions may be drawn. The first is that the research world has not identified, inquired into, nor disseminated findings in areas of practice which might support practitioners in relation to process-based outcomes. This type of research would be a necessary precondition to establishing *why* certain outcomes occur as opposed to accepting they do and setting about demonstrating that. The second is my suggestion that the reason those involved in outdoor education (instructors, principals and school teachers) have difficulty in thinking about evaluating or measuring outdoor education is that they are looking at the wrong thing. The clue to this came from Pirsig (1974) who refers to the source of this problem as the horns of a dilemma. He suggests, with others (e.g. Kant, 1993; Russell, 1979), that the whole history of western philosophy has wrestled with the dilemma of the subject and the object. Pirsig (1974: 232) asks of himself 'does this undefined "quality" of yours exist in the things we observe...or is it subjective existing only in the observer?' Here Pirsig (1974) is implying that the world can be understood in very different ways.

To be objective is to stand apart from the subjects of the world ('the things we observe' - including people) in order to understand them. Bernstein (1983: 8) defines objectivity as 'the basic conviction that there must be some permanent, ahistorical

matrix or framework to which we can ultimately appeal in determining the nature of rationality, knowledge, truth, reality, goodness, or rightness'. Objectivity is appealing to human beings because it appears to offer sure knowledge of the world. As May (1997: 10) observes the tenets of objectivity are characterised by believing in 'the prediction and explanation of the behaviour of phenomena...'. However, this concentration on the objective horn of Pirsig's dilemma has been at the expense of subjective understandings (Bernstein, 1983; Pepper, 1986; May, 1997). This is because to stand apart from the world is to view it as a distant observer and not as a fellow participant.

On the one hand researchers of outdoor education tend to inquire by way of objective means attempting to predict the likelihood of outcomes related to issues such as teambuilding, self-esteem and self-awareness. On the other hand practitioners use the terms uncritically to justify practice. What is missing from both sides, although for very different reasons, is a valid conception of the subjective. This point is not lost on Iain who, discussing the relative merits of evaluation, stated:

it is very subjective..., it's an emotional interaction and we become part of it as well so it's difficult for us to judge beyond, because we're interacting as well.

I am suggesting therefore that residential outdoor education is caught in a metaphysical trap. On the one hand there is the rhetoric that quantitative outcome based evaluation is important, but is not done. On the other, practice may be viewed as subjective, more in keeping with the instructors' preferences than curricular guidelines or organisational design. This is why there is so much rhetoric surrounding personal and social development. Centre staff are, with minor modifications, doing what they have always done, whilst adopting the language they feel wants or needs to be heard. The practice of one thing and defence of it by another also goes a long way to explaining why centres have been unsuccessful in operationalising the concepts which underpin personal and social development. In short they are talking about a quantitative metaphysical understanding of the world whilst practising within a subjective understanding. This also explains why instructors have difficulty in coming to terms with issues like evaluation and measurement.

When this sophistic reasoning is made clear then other evidence begins to make sense. During one observation I noted a mutual regard between Miller and the pupils. I asked him about this and he replied, 'I know it sounds daft but I want them to know I can be their friend as well as their instructor'. Later, during interview, Miller told me that the local authority had a policy which stated that 'every child is special' and he used that as a guiding principle. This position is supported by Ladhar Bheinn's principal who

states the ‘educational imperative (depends on) the point of delivery and the interaction between the instructor and the children’. However despite a widespread recognition that this interface is important, it is seen as a means to an end. It does not feature, as Iain suggested, as an aim unto itself.

Although primary and secondary sources surrounding this metaphysical separation are singularly absent in the UK outdoor education literature (the absence may in fact support my claim), a recent meta-analysis of 43 separate research studies was conducted in North America. Despite focussing exclusively on quantitative outcome based measurement such as self-esteem and self-awareness this study concluded: ‘many potentially important variables are not routinely documented in the research. For example, leadership styles are rarely taken into account...’ (Cason and Gillis, 1994: 46). This meta-analysis (a quantitative psychological measurement defined as ‘a statistical technique for accumulating and representing results reported in various studies’ (Neill and Richards, 1998: 3)), found that more attention needed to be paid to the ‘characteristics of group leaders, as well as qualitative data’ (Cason and Gillis, 1994: 43).

Summary

The propositions relating to interpersonal relationships, self-esteem and self- awareness have been developed alongside a five dimensional framework consisting of aims, assumptions, content, methods and claims. The framework allowed each proposition to be analysed in relation to each of the five dimensions. This intersecting framework provided the basis from which to conceptualise residential outdoor education. The conceptual contents of the framework were then scrutinised by a method used by Wurdinger (1997) known as ‘critical analysis’.

Table 3: A Conceptual Framework

	Aims	Assumptions	Content	Method	Claims
Interpersonal relationships					
Self esteem					
Self awareness					

The rationale for developing self-awareness is found within the PSD (SOED, 1993c) document. Instructor testimony reveals aims ranging in scope from pupils being aware of self, to pupils understanding their role and power to act within society. There is no shortage of testimony from instructors and principals to suggest that these aims are

being met. However, in making explicit hidden assumptions relating to the nature of values, the content of outdoor education and the connection between outdoor education and society, I have come to question the validity of such claims.

I have shown that the content of outdoor education is particularly important to any claims relating to the development of self-awareness. This is particularly so where the issues relating to values are discussion based. To contribute to this aspect of self-awareness, non-technical, low excitement activities such as hillwalking offer appropriate opportunities. This type of activity should be distinguished from activities which are either excitement led or technique dependent (e.g. kayaking, abseiling or high ropes) where discussion relies more on the conscious efforts of instructors to create opportunities than those that are student led and occur naturally. The evidence suggests that in the case of the former the instructor is more occupied with safety routines and the teaching of skills to the point that such conversations are less likely to occur. The evidence also shows that centre staff are unwilling to change programmes in order that particular aims are pursued. Instead there is a tendency to justify the inclusion of activities within the weekly programme by citing a range of aims which *might* be met. This makes it very difficult to pin down the exact nature of what is being attempted at both individual and organisational levels. This is best summed up in Miller's testimony:

That is the worrying thing...and that is why it appears to be so complicated because people are justifying it from lots of different points of view. But what might be true, to claim a personal and social development from the week for every kid might not be true. To do that over-exaggerates the claim because you can always point to the kid who is no different, but for some kids there may well be a discernible improvement but whether it is measurable...?

Centre principals have a major task in keeping their centres open. All evidence points towards stricter financial controls and pressure on individual centres to become more financially self supporting. Amongst this financial insecurity and mindful of the recent centre closures (Nicol, 1999), it would appear that staff have become defensive in their support of outdoor education. There is a tendency to defend centre work by linking it to the classroom. The most common claim in this respect is that pupils appear to behave better in class following a residential experience. There is no evidence to suggest that instructors set out to achieve this aim. Nor is there evidence to suggest that instructors routinely alter their daily activities to relate what is done at an outdoor centre to the classroom. So whilst centre staff are keen to be associated with class based learning (for defensive reasons) there is no substantial evidence of tailored programmes to suit.

Indeed the classroom behaviour argument is a retrospective one. Because programmes are not designed to make this happen, centre staff have found this out more by chance than programme design. There is, therefore, a defence of existing practice without reflection as to why pupils behave better following a week at an outdoor centre. This is in keeping with the claim of Hopkins and Putnam's (1993: ix) that the area lacks 'a clear and simple exposition of principles and, as a consequence, practice has not been well enough informed (and there has been) insufficient reflection by practitioners on the nature of the process of (outdoor education)'. Indeed evidence from one centre suggests that far from choosing activities to satisfy the aim of self-awareness, new activities are being introduced based on client demand. The willingness to deliver activities on demand compounds the already confusing relationship between activities and aims to the point that the activity becomes the dominant focus.

Paul suggested of his own centre staff colleagues that they have 'become quite institutionalised and set in their ways'. The hallmarks of institutionalisation pervade provision and is characterised by Iain's remark that 'personal and social development was just something that somebody realised that we do'. In other words it has no history of rational development. Residential outdoor education has therefore developed in a piecemeal fashion without the clear rationale sought by Hopkins and Putnam (1993). In response to contemporary threats it appears to have sought justification in aligning itself with mainstream education. It should be recognised that although this may seem justifiable and even desirable, this was not the original rationale. Outdoor education developed as a radical educational experiment of the sort practised and espoused by Loader (1952) and Mackenzie (1970) not the conservative manifestation now observable.

These philosophical issues come at a time when alternative opportunities open to schools directly compete with residential outdoor education. The advent of 'Devolved Management of Resources', reported in Chapter Three, has given school head-teachers more control over whether they want to use outdoor centres and which centres they use. Evidence from the local authority departments (Chapter Seven) suggest that schools are increasingly using private centres. The question then needs to be, 'in what way does the quality of experience at a private centre differ from that at a local authority centre?' If, for example, the commercial centre is offering outdoor activities without attaching instrumental claims and the local authority continues to make those claims, which remain largely unproven, then the question needs to be asked, 'what is the difference between a commercial centre and a local authority centre?' Given the increasing financial pressures on local authorities one wonders if any distinction between a commercial sector centre and public sector centre, in terms of the pupils' experience,

remains valid.

Outdoor centres from either sector can't even claim that the residential aspect is unique because, as Sammy pointed out, residential experiences are available within the voluntary sector through the Scouts and Guides movements. To stretch a point one could even argue that pupils would get a residential experience if their school were to organise a visit to Disneyland when they stay in overnight accommodation. It is not beyond the realms of possibility that the same personal and social development arguments used to defend residential outdoor education could be used in defence of any of these other activities. To cast a critical eye further it is possible to argue that teamwork, self-esteem and self-awareness are not the sole prerogative of the outdoor instructor as the school teacher can devise class based activities to satisfy these aims and that these can be readily contextualised without the need to 'transfer' them.

I have adopted this critical stance in order to deconstruct some of the taken for granted assumptions within residential outdoor education. There are good reasons for doing so. Residential outdoor education is being scrutinised and increasingly being asked to justify itself. In order to survive it has had to develop a set of defensive arguments. It is now at the point where it must distinguish itself from a host of competing options available to schools. If residential outdoor education continues to position itself within the competitive financial arena then there is a danger that it will be judged on financial criteria alone. I am suggesting that the choice of financial arguments is the wrong option and that a proper justification of any educational endeavour should begin with educational philosophy (Whitehead, 1950; Russell, 1977; White, 1982; Rogers, 1983; O' Sullivan, 1999). This is not to suggest that cost is unimportant so much as to suggest that educational benefits and costs must be viewed in relation to each other and, more importantly, that the principles are defining the cost and not the cost the principles.

Residential outdoor education therefore needs to distinguish itself from the experiences with which it is increasingly competing. However, because of the historical absence of programme evaluation and measurement, current practice continues with little regard to how those claims are evaluated in either an empirical or philosophical manner. Where staff do refer to evidence they rely on anecdotal sources but in the same breath say it is not enough. I have suggested that many of these concerns are the result of being caught in a metaphysical trap. Defensive attitudes are forcing centre staff into a position where they feel the need to argue their case based on objective criteria not necessarily compatible with current practice. Rather than evaluate and defend their position on the basis of a process centred, subjective metaphysics, staff have favoured the more outcome based objective stance. It is precisely this metaphysical incongruity

which prevents staff being able to conceptualise their work and articulate it in terms of aims, assumptions, content, methods and claims.

ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION

The Rhetoric of Evaluation

In Chapters Five, Six, Seven and Eight I presented evidence to show how the practice of outdoor education in local authority residential centres proceeds without an identifiable philosophical foundation, nor is there evidence that practice has developed by any formative or rational means. I deduce that this has arisen because of the numerous claims made of it, each from a variety of perspectives. Nowhere is this more apparent than within the complex issues of aims relating to personal and social development, the evaluation of which remains elusive for instructors and principals alike. This has resulted in a rhetoric surrounding personal and social development which, on one level, would appear to indicate a universal appeal, but on another masks a lack of common agreement as to underpinning philosophy and teaching methods. Thus the apparent agreement over what is being achieved (that which is claimed) belies an almost impenetrable collection of claims which have little reference to theoretical frameworks.

Furthermore, disproportionate attention has been given to aims relating to personal and social development at the expense of other areas of outdoor education. This difference of degree has been compounded because of the tendency of research to focus on outcomes. As long as this situation remains the opportunity to pose questions of a philosophical nature remain diminished. Take, for example, the question, 'to what purpose is outdoor education most suited?' By posing such questions it is possible to withdraw from *what* is done (the practice) to ask *why* it is done (underpinning ideas). This may be explained with reference to metaphor.

Imagine first that outdoor education is represented by the pouring of sand into a wide brimmed funnel and evaluation takes the form of observing what comes out the narrow end. Whilst acknowledging the value of outcome based research (the sand flowing from the funnel) there is a danger that this becomes the acknowledged, and only way, of understanding it. When one's concentration is not fixed upon the mechanics of this operation there is room for deeper questions. Why this particular funnel, would another one do, what dimensions would be optimal? Is a funnel the best way of organising the sand prior to measurement? What is the nature of the sand before it enters the funnel? Is it dry and therefore flows faster or wet and clogs the funnel? Furthermore, the idea of sand entering the wide brim and exiting the narrow end suggests the sand can only go one way and this being determined by external forces. The metaphor implies deterministic forces are at work. In the case of the sand and the funnel it is the physical law of gravity that is involved. In the case of outdoor education

there is a danger that social forces can result in social action without the people involved being aware of the existence of such forces. These 'invisible' forces are the very same as the unquestioned assumptions Evernden (1985) was referring to (see Chapter Seven).

These were precisely the concerns of Kuhn (1962) who reasoned that the philosophy of science shows that research inquiry has two dimensions. Firstly, there is the type which passes through the funnel; and second, there is the funnel itself (he used a box as a metaphor, I have developed the idea into a funnel as it implies input/output). Kuhn (1962) argues that when operating within the box (funnel) one takes for granted its structure and the composition of its contents. In terms of residential outdoor education, particularly where instructors are asked to justify what they do, there is a tendency to look towards outcomes (outputs) and not processes and methods. If analysis remains focussed on end products then this means that the basis by which one practices (historically as well as contemporary) and the principles on which content is based, can become neglected. In such cases measurement is not as appropriate as is the setting out of clear aims and objectives to be achieved by focussed programmes. Where this is the case the task is to identify the aims, assumptions, content and methods and the relationship between them, *in advance* of any attempt to evaluate.

Because of this I would like to put aside ideas of evaluation for the moment, and return to philosophical first principles. I would like to invert the idea that the analysis of a process begins with its end point. At the same time I would like to isolate one of the competing claims made of outdoor education (environmental education) and develop an analytic narrative whereby my primary data are evaluated explicitly against first principles. The principle in question is the ecological ontology referred to in Chapter Two. Up to this point I have used the assumptions central to this ontology to review the practice of outdoor education. Any critique therefore has begun from this perspective; as such it is a critique of current practice. If programmes are to progress by more rational means then analysis has to transcend practice and its evaluation. This can be done by a thorough examination of the funnel itself rather than concentrating on what comes out the narrow end. The aim of this chapter is to determine the extent and meaning of environmental education (as practised at these centres), looking at *existing* elements of practice where the defining element of 'good practice' will be deep ecology.

Personal and Social Development - A Disproportionate Entity

Whilst the potential for outcomes relating to personal and social development are well documented (Mortlock, 1984; Hunt, 1989; Hopkins and Putnam, 1993; Barrett and Greenaway, 1995; Gair, 1997), those relating to environmental education are less so.

Those sources which have ventured opinions on environmental education do so with regard to its relationship with personal and social development. This is to say that personal and social development and environmental education are viewed as convergent as opposed to being something different. With convergence in mind Keighley (1998) writes about the spiritual dimension which links people and place through an appreciation of nature. Drengson (1980) espouses similar views and further suggests that spiritual elements should include other people and even other forms of life. The Dartington conference (Department of Education and Science, 1975) and Higgins and Loynes (1997) agree that the aims of personal and social development, the outdoor activity and environmental education all overlap leaving the instructor to decide in which domain it is appropriate to work. Cooper (1994) sees the aims and processes of environmental education as synonymous with personal and social education. Hogan (1992) believes that the wilderness environment has sacred connotations which impact on human development. Brookes (1999) discusses the philosophical contradictions (ontological and epistemological) inherent in using the environment for nature-based tourism. There is also the early contribution of Drasdo (1972) whose prompting within the philosophical domain of aesthetics has gone largely ignored (Nicol and Higgins, 1998).

There is even less work of an empirical nature in this area. In a complex research project utilising data from play, work and games (indoor and outdoor) Csikszentmihalyi (1975) developed the concept of 'flow theory'. Using rock climbing as one area of inquiry, he found that the mechanics of this activity can lead to an intrinsically enjoyable experience resulting in feelings of harmony with the environment. Kaplan and Talbot (1983) concluded a ten year investigation into the psychological benefits of wilderness experience by stating it was both powerful and pervasive in its impact and they were impressed by the durability of that residue in the human makeup.

Environmental Education as a Neglected Form of Inquiry

Kaplan and Talbot (1983) are representative of the wider research enterprise related to outdoor education. The motive behind their research is to 'improve' the human condition. From a deep ecology perspective this type of work may be described as anthropocentric, where anthropocentric is taken to mean human-centred (Bowers, 1993; Capra, 1996). On the other hand the deep ecological field-worker would look to the principle of 'biospherical egalitarianism' (Naess, 1989: 28) to guide both research endeavours and practical outlets. Whilst recognising the right to utilise nature for human need, biospherical egalitarianism suggests that human need should be moderated by a 'deep-seated respect, even veneration, for other ways and forms of life' (Naess, 1989: 28). In this manner respect for life transcends, but does not exclude, the

anthropocentric concerns of human well-being to embrace the non-human world. Because of its focus the body of research relating to outdoor education, including that which claims to relate to environmental education, has been anthropocentric asking only 'in what way can the environment enhance the human condition' as opposed to 'in what way can the environment and the human condition be enhanced together'. The fact that no critical discussion of the UK outdoor education perspective has appeared in the literature is in itself a measure of the lack of commitment to the area.

Addressing the Imbalance

If the research focus relating to outdoor education has been dominated by anthropocentric approaches then the focus for me is to determine; first, the extent to which the anthropocentric paradigm is found in the practice of my research sites; and second, to determine the barriers and opportunities in delivering a more 'ecocentric' programme (where nature is respected for its own sake (Pepper, 1986: 27)). In order to achieve this I will be presenting two layers of data. The first of these is based on the same observations and interviews with instructors from which the data for Chapters Five, Six, Seven, and Eight were taken. The other layer draws on data from a second hour long interview with principals where the questions were more specifically directed towards *environmental* education. Because the former actually took place before the latter I was able to question principals on aspects of the instructors' work which I had observed. In this way there is a developing analysis which begins with practice through to organisational policy, the purpose of which is to identify the nature of environmental education.

Within the context of a multi-activity programme (the lion's share of programmes at these centres) two important distinctions must be understood. The first is where the whole programme focusses on environmental education. In such cases every activity is included because of its environmental education focus. This whole programme approach must be distinguished from a programme where an environmental education activity is one of a number of a series of activities (8-10 per programme would be usual). Pond dipping is a case in point since its inclusion in a programme often appears alongside other activities such as climbing and canoeing.

At this point it is possible to identify two different programmes. The first is totally committed to environmental education whilst the second includes specific activities which have an environmental focus. The data I will present shows there to be an inverse relationship between the amount of environmental education in a programme and the frequency with which it occurs. In other words there is more evidence of the second than there is of the first. This point is important because it helps to distinguish between environmental education which is both 'focussed' and 'sequential' (Van

Matre, 1990: 4) as opposed to environmental education which is supplemental and not an integral part of the programme.

Programmes Where Environmental Education is not Integral

Throughout the early chapters two themes have consistently emerged. Common to both is, in terms of structure and balance, they feature as secondary to the overall programme aims of personal and social development or skill acquisition. In this sense they are consequential because they do not feature as a major focus in the way that instructors conceptualise their work. However, whilst pursuing the personal and social development or skill acquisition aims, instructors make use of the opportunities to address these themes. The themes already identified are Countryside Code and countryside interpretation.

Countryside Code

- Don't leave litter
- Don't vandalise the environment
- Cars should not be dumped in the countryside
- Don't climb gates
- Don't leave gates open
- Don't disturb farm animals
- Be quiet in the countryside

All of the data items in this typology were observed by me at different stages of the research. As a code it has a distinctive feature, namely all of the data items are things you cannot do as opposed to things you can. This negativity begins to indicate the limitations of this form of endeavour. This is because the data items within the Countryside Code typology are essentially a set of imposed values. Where this is the case Posch (1993) suggests that pupils are not acting in accordance with the values they aspire to but reacting to external pressures. What is missing here is an understanding of why pupils are being asked, for example, to be quiet and shut gates. The assumption underpinning this typology is that the instructors have a notion of environmental quality and they expect pupils to act in accordance with this perception.

There is common agreement amongst instructors that litter is contrary to aesthetic consciousness and may also lead to the harm of wildlife. However Smyth (1999) points out that concerns which relate *only* to 'environmental quality' are limiting. Thus, environmental education has a further dimension which is 'holistic in terms of both environment and humanity, values-orientated, issue-based, action-orientated and critical' (Smyth, 1999: 74). What the idea of 'environmental quality' must have therefore, is a social context in which to discuss it. This means that a holistic

understanding of the data items in the typology requires that some treatment of the social context in which being 'quiet in the countryside' is deemed 'good'. This therefore removes the emphasis of controlling behaviour to understanding one's behaviour in relation to societal norms.

If understanding societal norms is central to this form of understanding then the four point epistemology referred to in Chapter Two needs to be recognised. The form of knowing most appropriate in this situation is through propositional knowing. This form of understanding involves knowing about something through ideas and theories (Reason, 1998). Only on two occasions did I observe any discussion that moved beyond environmental quality to include societal norms. The first (described in Chapter Eight) was a discussion of various points of view from a conservation versus development issue relating to a mountain development. The second occurred during a hillwalk and after a snack break. Chris drew attention to the fact that some of the pupils had left some sweet wrappers on the ground. He asked them to pick the litter up and then asked them to think about why he had asked them. The pupils responded very much in line with aesthetic concerns suggesting that it did not look nice. Chris then asked them if they dropped litter when they were at home. Some said 'no' and Chris then began probing about the difference between living in the city and living and recreating in the countryside. For those who said that they did drop litter at home Chris then dealt with this by pointing out how different people had different views about different things. This led to a discussion about how some litter is harmful to wildlife (e.g. broken glass) and how industrial waste and spillage can affect food chains. In this way litter was not simply part of the Countryside Code but could be understood in terms of; first, an aesthetic issue; second, as a source of danger to wildlife; third, a way of discussing urban and rural issues; fourth, a way of discussing human impact on the environment; and fifth, a means of introducing simple ecological principles and food chains.

The second theme under this heading, where environmental education is not integral, is where the instructors point out features to the pupils. This theme is known as 'countryside interpretation', developed in earlier chapters. Typical examples would be the naming of trees, a glacial feature, a type of plant, spotting a buzzard and so on. These were sometimes extended to include more complex patterns such as the water cycle (Michael), the dependence of trees on the sun as an energy source (Paul) and the relationship between lichen, algae and rocks (Iain). Common to all these is that it is a direct form of information dissemination where the instructor has the knowledge and the pupils are told things. This relationship between instructor and pupil can be extended so that pupils interact more with what they are learning. Michael provided one example where the group came across a gaggle of geese. He asked, 'are the geese

in good health?’ After some thought one pupil suggested that the geese looked well fed. By deduction they figured that if they looked ‘well fed’ then that was a sign of ample food which led them to investigate what the geese might be eating. In another example Iain picked up a piece of rotten birch tree and began an interactive conversation around the way in which Native Americans would use these natural materials to build canoes. This led to discussions about how different cultures in space and time had different relationship with the landscape.

Whilst countryside interpretation and practising the Countryside Code are undoubtedly important to outdoor education, it is a limited aspiration and is symptomatic of the relationship between instructors and pupils. Instructors display a trend of reluctance to embrace a more expansive view of the content and delivery of outdoor education generally and environmental education specifically. Consequently, the place of environmental education within outdoor education remains modest and unambitious. Taking account of the situation in North America, Van Matre (1990) has concluded that many people have defined environmental education as something that happens outside and since outdoor education also takes place outside there is an assumption that instructors are already doing it. In this way Van Matre (1990: 25) begins to distinguish between the different sets of interests which identify the difference between environmental education and outdoor education.

OE

1. Curriculum enrichment and application
2. Recreational skills and outdoor pursuits
3. Socialisation experience and group development

EE

1. How do the ecological systems of the Earth function?
2. How are we personally tied into these systems in our lives?
3. How can we make changes (individually and collectively) in order to lessen our impact upon these systems?

Evidence from interviews demonstrates the uncritical way in which environmental education is conceptualised. The data can be separated into two distinct layers of meaning. The first is superficial whereby all of the instructors agree that their work includes environmental education. An example of this would be Geraldine’s view that ‘every activity was environmental’, when what she was referring to was picking up (or not dropping) litter. A similar example would be Martin’s view that environmental education was about developing an appreciation through being in beautiful places. He suggested ‘it could be just a single moment on top of a hill seeing a sunrise or sunset

or whatever, or just something amazing really'. What Martin is implying is that you just need to be there to soak up the experience.

The second layer is where instructors (Stan, Martin, Sammy and Ian) concur with Michael's sentiment that:

we have seashore studies directly related to environmental studies and the rest of it is just piecemeal. When we are there we see things.

Similarly the principal of Lochnagar suggests 'there would be no check at the end of the week as to whether one particular group had been introduced (to ecological concepts)...so... it could be a little bit hit and miss in that sense'. This would appear to be a more accurate and honest appraisal of the role of environmental education within multi-activity programmes. It is reinforced by Ladhar Bhein's principal who stated, 'I wouldn't pretend every single outdoor activity had some environmental component'. These data accurately mirror Van Matre's (1990) description of the North American situation where environmental education was described without focus, without sequence and happened simply because people were 'out there'.

Programmes Where Some Activities Have a Primary Environmental Education Focus

Michael referred to 'seashore studies' as an activity which he clearly distinguished from the piecemeal approach to environmental education. This is one of a number of activities used by centres which have a recognised focus on environmental education and appear in the programme alongside outdoor pursuits (e.g. canoeing and climbing). The complete list of those I encountered were:

- Pond studies
- Seashore studies
- Earth walk
- Survival game

The first two are activities offered by Beinn Dearg. As pointed out in Chapter Five these activities belong to the field studies tradition because of their links with school curriculum subjects such as biology, geography and geology (Cooper, 1991). Michael likes to use them because they demonstrate to pupils 'how much life there is'. However, I used the term 'encountered' because although instructors referred to pond studies and seashore studies they were not part of the programme whilst I was there and so I did not observe them. Despite this I have included them because when instructors talk about them there is some testimony which indicates clear preferences amongst other Beinn Dearg staff which question their inclusion. For example Chris

and Tim argued that they are less adventurous than outdoor pursuits and therefore less appealing to the pupils. Chris and Tim represent one perspective with the remainder of instructors at Beinn Dearg remaining ambivalent about their inclusion. Another way of looking at this is, of the six Beinn Dearg staff only Michael offered firm support for their inclusion.

Responses from principals and instructors showed that all of the centres except Carn an Fhìdhleir deliver Earthwalks. I observed one of these at An Teallach (this is discussed more fully below). When I asked principals why there seemed to be a lack of specific environmental activities in programmes all five explained that it was for the schools to choose their programme, a point confirmed in Chapters Five and Six. In this way centres tend to distance themselves from the opportunity to include environmental education activities. It could be significant that the *PSD 5-14* document (SOED, 1993c) refers specifically to outdoor education whereas the *Environmental Studies* (SOED, 1993a) document does not. Whilst there is an implicit view that education may take place 'beyond the classroom' there is no recognition of outdoor education as a specific context. This situation is under review with the 5-14 *Environmental Studies* document currently being revised.

The 'survival game' is an activity specific to An Teallach. It is a form of role play where pupils pretend they are some form of non-human life. The idea is to introduce food chains and energy cycles, both of which were explained to the pupils in the laboratory prior to going out. This was done in an interactive way through 'Socratic questioning' so that the instructor copied the pupils' ideas of food chains on a wipe board. This took the form of a pyramid of circles with the bottom circles representing carrots, the next rabbits, the next foxes with a wildcat on top (the instructor explained that strictly speaking the wild cat would share its position with a fox rather than represent a link above. However, this is the pupils' developing ideas of a food chain and is pedagogically important to the idea about to emerge). The difference between herbivore, carnivore and omnivore was discussed. The pupils then took on the role of one of the five layers of the food chain and wore a badge to indicate such. They then played a game of hide and seek in the woods whereby the food chain became a 'reality' and predators ate prey (and kept their prey's badge to signify this). On their return, the pupil at the top of the food chain would think that s/he had 'won' until it was explained that there were human induced toxins in the food chain and that the top predator (having consumed those lower down the food chain) had ingested toxins and was about to die. This led to a class based session where the focus was the relationship between the human and non-human world.

From the description of this activity three points emerge. When Tim said that 'pond

studies is unpopular because it is like a classroom activity' the survival game represents contrary evidence to suggest that, whether it is a class related activity or not, the prejudices of instructors influence what are perceived to be 'legitimate activities'. The second point is, as far as environmental education is concerned, there is an admission that things could be better. Beinn Dearg's principal suggested 'I don't think we're doing as good a job as we could possibly do'. Similarly, Lochnagar's principal suggested that enthusiasm for environmental education rests with each instructor and that varies from one to another. Carn an Fhìdhleir's principal stated that he does not offer specific activities aimed at environmental education and points to the lack of staff training by way of explanation. The third point relates to the belief that an outdoor education centre is not the place to deliver environmental education. For example, Sammy suggested that the pupils come from an area where there is a ranger service and assumes that environmental education will be available to all pupils there. Sammy's principal (Ladhar Bheinn) took the argument further suggesting that centres have no more responsibility than any other form of education in delivering environmental education.

The weight of evidence so far points to the delivery of environmental education at outdoor education centres as being of secondary interest. Where it does feature it comes in one of three forms. The first is where the odd activity is included in a multi-activity programme amongst a number of outdoor activities (such as canoeing and climbing); the second, I have categorised as the 'Countryside Code' normally imposed through didactic means; the third I have categorised as 'countryside interpretation' where the instructor takes an active role in naming features and explaining geophysical cycles. All of these depend to a large extent on the enthusiasm of each individual instructor. These can be summarised as:

1. programme issues (related to schools and outdoor centres)
2. the Countryside Code (imparting rules)
3. countryside interpretation (the instructor as landscape interpreter).

From this categorisation certain themes emerge which indicate personal and institutional barriers which influence the inclusion of environmental education within outdoor education programmes. At an institutional level (point one) the evidence suggests that schools are not asking for environmental education and therefore the centres are not supporting it in any focused manner. At a personal level (points two and three) inclusion depends on the enthusiasm of the individual instructors. These issues become more apparent when considering the situation of An Teallach which *does* offer week long courses whose primary focus is the delivery of environmental education in a focussed and sequential manner.

Programmes of Environmental Education Which are Focussed and Sequential (Earth Education)

The type of course in question is the Institute of Earth Education's (IEE) *Earthkeepers*. During an interview with An Teallach's principal I established that *Earthkeepers* courses are more expensive to run than a week long multi-activity programme (they are very labour intensive). The principal also indicated that there was not a great demand for them from the schools. I asked therefore, why, despite these barriers, the centre continued to run them (three every year). The principal replied 'because I believe in them'. Significantly, of the other centres, only Lochnagar offered *Earthkeepers* courses and the principal reported that they too found it difficult to interest schools. Since I wanted to observe one of these courses the only centre who could guarantee running them in the year 1999 was An Teallach. What this paragraph indicates is that despite the institutional barrier represented by perceived lack of school interest in environmental education, An Teallach has overcome this by marketing the idea to schools. It would appear therefore that what appeared as two barriers (the school and the centre) are not so formidable when there is enthusiasm to deliver the course. Consequently, some of the centre's training budget has been used to join the IEE, invest in staff training to deliver the course and to purchase the necessary materials (the course is 'prop' intensive).

Earthkeepers

Cohen and Manion (1994: 89) state that researchers can 'handpick the cases to be included...they build up a sample that is satisfactory to their specific needs'. I have used this purposive sampling strategy to highlight that, as far as environmental education is concerned, An Teallach is different from the other centres. Because it has been singled out for special treatment a different research approach is used. The *Earthkeepers* course was run over a three day period for 36 pupils and staffed by six instructors. The large pupil group was split into smaller groups and it was planned that, over the three days, the groups would rotate around a series of activities hosted by different instructors. I had the choice of shadowing one instructor for the three days or shadowing a group. If I shadowed an instructor this would mean that I would be observing some activities more than once and some not at all. For this reason I attached myself to one group for the three days so I could observe every aspect of the course. Informal interviews with instructors took place throughout the three days. These were used to seek clarification on technical issues. In this respect they were more descriptive questions asking what was going on as opposed to why. I used a waterproof notebook to take notes and record observations. Since the course follows a prescribed programme, recording of information was in a sense pre-coded. I had in my possession a copy of the *Earthkeepers* handbook which includes the prescribed course outline. Consequently, I had only to follow the sequence of events noting any deviation and adding my own tentative analysis. Since the programme involves evening activities,

observations began at approximately 0900 and continued to 2130.

In discussing *Earthkeepers* I will maintain the conceptual framework as followed in the previous chapters (aims, assumptions, content, methods and claims).

Aims

Earthkeepers is an educational course designed by the IEE in North America and delivered by organisations affiliated to the Institute. In delivering this course An Teallach is required to abide by the standard course content, rationale and aims set out by the Institute. It is a package for 10-12 year olds and neatly fits the primary seven age group who represent the majority of pupils visiting An Teallach. The course is completed back in the classroom thereby making a connection between the school and centre. The aim is 'to teach students why and how to live more lightly on the Earth and to help them develop a deeper personal relationship with it' (Van Matre and Johnson, 1987: xi). I asked the instructors working on the course if they shared this aim to which they all replied 'yes'.

Assumptions

The first point to note is that the IEE prefer the term 'earth education' as opposed to 'environmental education'. This choice reflects the belief that environmental education has failed. It has failed, according to Van Matre (1990: 5), because environmental education practitioners do not address 'how life functions ecologically, what this means for people in their own lives and what these people are going to have to do in order to lessen their impact on the Earth'. The primary data I have presented in this chapter indicate why Van Matre is suspicious of the term 'environmental education'. It is his view that historically programmes in North America were devised whereby 'the activities were created first and their objectives formulated later' (Van Matre, 1990: 7). This is the pattern that I have been describing throughout this thesis where programmes of outdoor pursuits were created first and objectives relating to environmental education were formulated later. One consequence of this is that promoters of 'earth education' see themselves as delivering something different. One of the manifestations of this relates to the nature of assumptions. Whereas the assumptions relating to environmental education in outdoor education remain hidden, those relating to 'earth education' are open and explicit. The explicit assumptions relating to *Earthkeepers*, taken from the course handbook, are summarised whereby 'apprentice earthkeepers' (the pupils) will return to school:

- understanding the essential idea of some basic ecological processes
- feeling better about the natural world and their relationship with it
- aware of the possibility of future rewards for their efforts

- motivated to carry on their own learning
- possessing the tools and plans for the next phase of their work
- knowing some things they can do personally to help solve our environmental problems (Van Matre and Johnson, 1987: xii).

Despite these explicit assumptions there are of course hidden assumptions. The first point is that the empirical basis on which these programmes were constructed is not available for scrutiny. Consequently, learning outcomes related to the explicit assumptions are assumed rather than known. Because the package is delivered in a prescribed way, with minimal alteration from the instructors, it is assumed that the package has inherent validity. This is clear in the statement that the package is 'synergistic - all of the pieces interact together in such a way that the whole becomes more than the sum of its parts' (Van Matre and Johnson, 1987: 8). Consequently, those who deliver the course do so on the basis that the package will deliver what it claims to. There is no evaluative mechanism to establish the extent to which the aims are achieved on a course-to-course basis. Nor is there evidence to explain the long term effects of the programme.

However, the assumptions underpinning *Earthkeepers* are supported from other sources. Smyth (1995: 9) states 'affective learning in early childhood may be the necessary basis on which to build more complex ideas'. Palmer (1998) suggests that early experience in the outdoors is a necessary pre-condition to formulating environmental attitudes and behaviour. These views are supported by a number of researchers whose empirical work is contributing to the growing body of literature known as 'Significant Life Experiences'. Their principal quest is to discover those formative experiences in peoples' lives which may, or may not, lead to certain forms of behaviour. For an overview of these papers see *Environmental Education Research*, 1999, 5 (4).

Content

Course content is designed to demonstrate that all living things, including human beings, are connected. The 'apprentice earthkeepers' are asked to think of people as human passengers on-board the Earth whose passage depends on its security. Understanding this requires knowledge of and feelings for the planet. To achieve this the 'apprentice earthkeepers' have to participate in four stages where the completion of each stage is recognised by the 'apprentice earthkeeper' gaining one of four keys. The word 'keys' is an acronym for:

- Knowledge
- Experience

- Yourself
- Sharing

‘Knowledge’ and ‘Experience’ are the programme components that An Teallach deals with whilst ‘Yourself’ and ‘Sharing’ are completed back at school. I will refer to the *Earthkeepers* course handbook (Van Matre and Johnson, 1987) to explain the ideas underpinning the course. The first two keys are earned by way of activity sessions predominantly out of doors. Using a series of ‘props’ pupils pursue their ‘knowledge key’ by engaging in set activities and learning about four ecological concepts (energy flow, nutrient cycling, interrelationships and change). An activity called ‘munchline monitors’ demonstrates the passage of energy from the sun, through photosynthesis to plants and subsequently to animals. The concept of ‘nutrient cycling’ is explained through an activity called the ‘great speck-tackle’ where ‘specks’ are taken to represent atoms. Through this activity pupils discover that atoms of hydrogen, carbon, oxygen, nitrogen, phosphorous and sulphur are of limited supply. The activity then shows how these atoms are distributed around the Earth through the soil, water and air cycles.

Through an activity called ‘inspection connection’ the concept of interrelationships is pursued. The activity shows how life can be understood as a series of connections between energy from the sun to soil, water and air. In this way it is possible to demonstrate food chains, how grass is connected to the sun, rabbits to grass, buzzards to rabbits and so on. The ‘web of life’ is presented as an interdependent community. The underpinning lesson is that if a strand of the web is affected (e.g. species extinction) there will be consequences for all beings connected to that species.

An activity called ‘time capsules’ is used to demonstrate ‘change’. The change referred to is how life began on the planet and how it transformed through time and evolved into its present condition. At this point the pupils will have taken part in activities designed for them to understand how life (human and nonhuman) evolved, how life is connected, how these connections affect each other (particularly the effect of human activity on the non-human world) and how these connections have implications for the well-being of the human and non-human world.

Methods

Central to the ‘experience’ component is that pupils are given the opportunity to adopt feelings for the environment. It is assumed that such feelings will lead pupils to care for the environment (Van Matre and Johnson, 1987). This is set about in a fourfold way (solitude, observation, discovery and immersion). By creating time for ‘solitude’ it is claimed that this experience will engender moments of fascination about the natural world. Through ‘observation’ pupils will have the opportunity to sharpen their

perceptions of the world around them. These observations will become more meaningful, it is claimed, if the pupils are encouraged to 'discover' the natural world themselves.

One of the contradictions in this approach is that the course is a largely manufactured experience. The programme itself is supposed to lead to discovery. However, learning opportunities in the outdoors do not always present themselves in a prescribed fashion. For example, wildlife can make an unexpected appearance. There is a danger that in remaining true to the edicts of the package instructors miss the opportunity of spontaneous learning opportunities.

Finally, it is intended that pupils have an 'immersive' experience in nature where it is envisaged that they can increase their sensory contact with the natural world. This depends on first hand experiences and direct contact with nature. One of the recommended ways of achieving this is the idea of a woodland theatre. Pupils are encouraged to act out a play writing the script inspired from what they see smell, hear and touch around them. The idea of sensory deprivation (e.g. blindfold) can also be introduced to offer another sensory perspective.

Because providers are required by the IEE to follow the *Earthkeepers* course as a package there are implications for evaluation. At this point it is important to note that my own observations show that the course programme described in the handbook was the same, in terms of content as that delivered by An Teallach. Consequently, when programme evaluation is restricted to the content and sequence of activities, An Teallach may be seen as delivering a programme in keeping with IEE guidelines.

Claims

However, what is not so easy to establish is the effectiveness of the programme in terms of the pupils' experience. Despite claims made of the *Earthkeepers* package (recorded in 'assumptions' above), the empirical basis on which the programme is based is not made known. This is important to acknowledge because the end goal of the *Earthkeepers* package is to promote lifestyle changes (Van Matre and Johnson, 1987). Since the programme does not take account of pupils' lifestyles at the point of entry, neither instructors at An Teallach, nor the teachers from school, have any systematic way of knowing if this has been achieved. Consequently, any long term benefits associated with the programme are assumed. Some in-course evaluation takes place through the the form of quizzes and questioning. This allows pupils to demonstrate sufficient knowledge of the ecological principles in order to be awarded their 'knowledge' and 'experience' keys.

However, because long term benefits are assumed it follows that there is an assumption that knowledge translates into behavioural change or action. This is a point that Van Matre and Johnson (1987) themselves are critical of which is why the follow-on at school and at home (which require actions) is an integral part of the course. However, what is not clear is whether these actions are intrinsically motivated (where pupils act in accordance with what they have learnt) or extrinsically motivated (pupils acting on the basis of blind faith), or perhaps, pupils not acting at all. The reader will recall from Chapter Two that this is the very distinction made by Naess (1989) whereby intrinsic motivation leads to an enlightened understanding of action deeply rooted in an ontological vision. Naess (1989) further argues that the ontological vision cannot be sustained if actions depend on extrinsic motivation since people will end up acting against their will and inclination. In terms of *Earthkeepers* therefore the relationship between knowledge and action remains undisclosed.

Furthermore, it should be noted that pupils do not have to demonstrate understanding since those who do not know the answers to questions may be assisted by their peers. Similarly the issue of feelings is not evaluated so much as pupils are supposed to participate in certain experiences. Since the second half of *Earthkeepers* takes place in school, An Teallach hands over the programme for follow on. In this sense the centre does not have control over evaluation. Technically speaking therefore the claims made of *Earthkeepers* remain rooted in the belief that the package can deliver what it claims. This further depends on the instructors following the prescribed sequence which is why I have suggested that the inherent validity of the package is assumed rather than known.

One of the dangers in assuming inherent validity is that the instructor may adopt the role of a technician who conveys knowledge without understanding it themselves, nor knowing if the pupils understand it. An example of this occurred when an instructor was describing the geophysical pattern of air cycling (how atoms are found in space and time) using the activity the 'great spectacle'. In summarising the activity the instructor suggested to the pupils that they could quite literally be breathing the oxygen that William Wallace had breathed. One of the pupils asked me quietly how was it possible for him (the pupil) to breathe in the oxygen that William Wallace breathed when the air that William Wallace breathed out was carbon dioxide. Despite being confused the pupil was demonstrating knowledge beyond that of the exercise.

Whether or not this is an isolated example is beyond the remit of this thesis. The reason I have included it is to demonstrate that it is a flawed assumption to rely on the inherent validity of *Earthkeepers*, the accuracy of which becomes more questionable if instructors adopt a slavish delivery style. However, it should be noted that a PhD

research project is presently underway at An Teallach to address this. Data are being gathered using a phenomenological approach to evaluate the pupils' experiences both during the course and after they return to school.

Summary

I began this chapter by demonstrating the lack of both secondary sources and empirical enquiry relating to environmental education within outdoor education. I deduced from this that environmental education has received significantly less treatment than other associated claims relating to the work of centres where there are abundant primary and secondary sources. Consequently, from a deep ecology perspective, the treatment of outdoor education, as an area of enquiry, has been largely anthropocentric. Through observation and interviews with instructors, as well as interviews with principals, the challenge of this chapter has been to establish the extent to which anthropocentricity found in the literature is found in the practice of my research sites.

The findings show that programmes can be described under one of two headings. The first is where environmental education is not an integral part of the programme. This raises conceptual problems related to the nature and definition of environmental education. For example, the evidence shows that instructors believe all outdoor activities include environmental education. This is borne out of the belief that pointing out features (animals or geographical) and/or practising the Countryside Code constitutes environmental education. Van Matre and Johnson (1987: 2) question the integrity of this approach because it is not 'focussed' nor 'sequential', and more importantly, that pupils learn nothing of the relationship between the human and non-human world. With this definition in mind the extent to which the inclusion of an odd activity, despite its overt environmental focus (e.g. seashore studies or pond dipping), within a programme of outdoor activities present conceptual difficulties and pedagogical uncertainty. Furthermore there are detectable prejudices amongst some instructors whereby such activities are seen as less legitimate than the traditional outdoor activities of, for example, kayaking and climbing. In this sense there is a degree of insincerity about the argument that all activities contain environmental education and the conceptually vague way this rhetoric is employed as a defence of outdoor education generally.

This leads on to the second heading where programmes of environmental education which are both 'focussed' and 'sequential'. Only the *Earthkeepers* course fits these criteria; and significantly, of the three centres who offer *Earthkeepers* only An Teallach could accommodate my request to observe a course for the year 1999. *Earthkeepers* is the only example of an environmental education programme where the outcomes are decided in advance of activities. In all other situations it is more

accurate to suggest that the programme governs the outcomes.

However, despite its appeal in terms of focus and sequence, there remains doubt about *Earthkeepers'* internal validity. Its empirical basis is not clear, there is no monitoring of impact after the programme, there are doubts over the extent to which delivery allows for spontaneous learning opportunities, there is evidence to suggest that factual scientific principles can be compromised for the sake of simplicity and where this is the case, the instructor becomes a technician (as opposed to someone who understands scientific and pedagogical principles and can apply them in a differential manner). Furthermore, the social context in which pupils live their lives is not fully considered. This is the point that Parry and Scott (1997: 1) make when they suggest 'many influences determine peoples' actions, not simply education'. Given that the follow up activities depend on parental involvement in the home; that the pupils need access to open spaces away from buildings and activity; and since it is reasonable to expect that not all parents have the same interest in their childrens' education; and given that an urban family's access to the countryside can be determined by socio-economic conditions; it would appear that there is a lack of evidence as to the suitability of *Earthkeepers* in every case. This point is more fully considered by Gurevitz (1997: 7) who states 'children's views on the environment are mainly formed through social influences such as the habits and values gained in family life and peer groups'.

Despite these issues *Earthkeepers* is the only aspect of outdoor education practice that I observed which tends towards ecocentrism. The remaining practices are clearly anthropocentric. Of all the claims considered throughout this thesis (interrelationships, self-esteem, self-awareness and environmental education) *Earthkeepers* is the most theoretically explicit area of work undertaken by centres. It is apparent what the programme sets out to achieve and how it will be achieved. From these observations it is clear that environmental education needs commitment and training (staff) and that learning does not occur simply through a process of 'osmosis' (pupils). Despite its ecocentric tendencies, however, there remains doubt as to whether *Earthkeepers* fits in with Naess' ecological ontology. From a deep ecology perspective the defining element is whether pupils who participate in *Earthkeepers* will act out of intrinsic motivation (which concurs with deep ecology) or whether they are extrinsically motivated (which does not conform with deep ecology's union of the ontological and psychological). Since the evaluation of pupils' experiences is not a feature of this thesis, this question must remain unanswered.

OUTDOOR EDUCATION AND SUSTAINABLE LIVING

In Chapter Seven the data showed that the term 'environmental education' presented instructors with definitional and perceptual difficulties. Despite this instructors still see environmental education as an important part of their work. These findings are supported and an explanation offered by Van Matre. He states 'if you cared about the Earth yourself and were working with people, then you were doing environmental education' (Van Matre, 1990: 111). In other words the discourse did not take cognisance of aims, assumptions, content and methods. The perceptions and definitions of instructors then are central to understanding environmental education in a residential outdoor education context. Furthermore, the data from earlier chapters shows that what passes for environmental education takes place in a theoretical void. It is based on unexamined assumptions which is implicit in Van Matre's (1990) criticism that definition and perception begins with practice. This form of practice may be seen as the beginning of an inductive enterprise (albeit an incomplete enterprise) since its practice has not been developed into general principles from which aims, assumptions, content and methods can be established. Consequently, the practice of environmental education at my research sites is not mediated by any theoretical understanding.

Having arrived at these conclusions I believed that I had gone as far as I could in understanding what instructors meant when they talked about environmental education. I had now arrived at a barrier, prevented from a fuller understanding by perceptual and definitional issues. In short, the observations and interviews had taken me to the point where I could interpret *current* practice. These data showed that the majority of instructors' work was in the area of skill acquisition and personal and social development. What passed for environmental education was both unfocussed, unsequential and compounded by the belief that environmental education was not a primary feature of instructors' work. This meant that, from a deep ecology perspective, the very practice of outdoor education was anthropocentric (with *Earthkeepers*, Chapter Nine, being the one possible exception).

I sensed a resistance to moving beyond anthropocentrism at the centres. It seemed to me that if the limited aspirations of instructors in relation to environmental education was to be fully understood then the barriers preventing this had to be identified. I wanted to explore the idea of barriers further and simultaneously identify the opportunities that outdoor education represents in terms of an ecocentric approach to environmental education. I chose to do this by inverting the way in which environmental education has developed at centres (practice first) and instead began with

a theoretical understanding of the area.

The first task was to explore the relationship between sustainable development, environmental education and outdoor education, from a body of literature not specific to outdoor education. This literature represents an opportunity to *look in* on outdoor education from another perspective as opposed to *looking out* from the point of practice, defence and justification.

Sustainable Development

To understand environmental education in a present day context it is important to take account of the historical emergence of sustainable development. The 1970s represent a major landmark in this developing and changing field of environmental education. This is most evidently seen in the IUCN definition (as cited in Palmer, 1998: 7) that,

environmental education is the process of recognising values and clarifying concepts in order to develop skills and attitudes necessary to understand and appreciate the inter-relatedness among man, his culture, and his biophysical surroundings.

What this definition represents is a recognition that the human environment and natural environment are not separate systems but part of the one whole. From a deep ecology perspective this was a major advance because Naess's (1988) ecological ontology shares with this definition that human beings were part of and not apart from the natural world.

Further clarity came from the 1977 Tbilisi conference (UNESCO, 1978: 25) where environmental education was given an international profile with the recommendation to:

show the economic, political and ecological interdependence of the modern world, in which decisions and actions by the different countries can have international repercussions.

In 1980 the *World Conservation Strategy* was published which introduced the concept of 'sustainable development' (IUCN, 1980). In it was a recognition that human well-being was linked to the maintenance of life-support systems, the maintenance of biodiversity and the sustainable use of natural resources. Later, the concept of 'sustainable development' was reinforced with the publication in 1987 of the *Brundtland Report*, the purpose of which was 'to reconcile environment with development, thus reinforcing and extending the core message of the *World Conservation Strategy*' (Palmer, 1998: 16). Smyth (1995: 12) says it also 'advocated participation in environmental action as an educational strategy for achieving its

aims...'. The document also suggested that an immediate follow up report should be undertaken to maintain strategic momentum.

Taking a lead from this recommendation and in response to increasing public and political concerns such as global climate change, the depletion of the ozone layer, acid rain, reduction in biodiversity, human population growth and 'the South's' claim that development was central to the alleviation of world poverty, the UN convened a conference in Rio in 1992. Consequently, human activity was shown to be inextricably linked to that of environmental responsibility (United Nations Conference on Environment and Development, 1992). For Harvey (1995) the most important outcome of Rio was the action plan *Agenda 21*. This document represents the most comprehensive exposition of sustainable development to date. Its aims are twofold and consist of; first, environmental (to protect the Earth's natural resources); and second, developmental (to ensure human use of resources are in keeping with carrying capacities) (UNCED, 1992).

Chapter 36 of *Agenda 21* is titled *Promoting Education, Public Awareness and Training* and is concerned with 'achieving environmental and ethical awareness, values and attitudes, skills and behaviour consistent with sustainable development and for effective public participation in decision making' (UNCED, 1992: 221). To be effective 'environment and development education should deal with the dynamics of both the physical, biological and socio-economic environment and human (which may include spiritual) development should be integrated in all disciplines' (UNCED, 1992: 221). This very broad view of education allows for national interpretation. Whereas some developing countries have immediate priorities such as the alleviation of poverty and improving literacy, it is more appropriate for the industrialised nations, such as the UK, to look at their consumption levels and the values that underpin consumerism. What *Agenda 21* makes clear is that every sector of society, which, by definition, includes outdoor education, has a responsibility towards education through both formal and informal methods (UNCED, 1992). At 'grass roots' level the role of education, in relation to *Agenda 21*, is to create active and informed citizens throughout civil society, engaged in actions consistent with sustainable development. As a signatory to *Agenda 21* this is what the UK government is committed to. These principles have been welcomed in Scotland in two distinct ways. First through publications such as *Down to Earth: A Scottish Perspective on Sustainable Development* (Scottish Office, 1999) which endorses the social, economic and educational aspects of sustainable development; and second, through the publication of documents such as *The Secretary of State for Scotland's Advisory Group on Education for Sustainable Development* (Advisory Group on Education for

Sustainable Development, 1999) which focusses specifically on the educational aspects of sustainable development.

Despite the recognition that human beings are part of the 'web of life' the concept of sustainable development has attracted criticism from deep ecology theorists. For example, Sessions (1995: 412) states the concept 'means different things to economists, political scientists, ecologists, and agrarian proponents...'. He further states that 'sustainable development (represents) political compromise that fails to deal adequately with the ecological crisis' (Sessions, 1995: 412).

Education and Sustainable Development

Within this global complexity educators have sought to locate the strategic vision of sustainable development into coherent theoretical standpoints. Fien (1993) and Huckle (1995) draw their inspiration from Marxism and Habermas's Critical Theory. They adopt the term Education *for* Sustainability (Huckle and Sterling (1996). On the one hand the proponents of education *for* the environment are concerned about socio-political inquiry, empowerment and equity issues (Jickling and Spork, 1998) in keeping with the tenets of Marxism. On the other is the perspective of deep ecology presented throughout this thesis which draws on the unity of the ontological and psychological (Naess, 1989). From these descriptions it is apparent that education *for* the environment is more concerned with sociological issues whilst deep ecology is more concerned with the psychological.

Shallcross (1996: 2) has summed this situation up stating:

while these two theoretical strands have clear differences of emphasis and ideology, both are transformational in the practices that they advocate. If deep ecologists can be persuaded that the eradication of social inequality, which is a prerequisite to achieving an egalitarian view of the biosphere..., is fundamentally a political process and socially critical educators appreciate that social focus is the means to an end and not the end itself, environmental education will be closer to a model which unites practice rather than one which divides it.

What Shallcross does in this passage is to identify key differences between two theoretical positions. However, Jickling and Spork (1998) are critical, not so much of the theories themselves but the way in which theories relating to environmental education have come to be used. For example, education *for* the environment is characteristic of how 'educational slogans can evolve into operational doctrines or unquestioned directions for practice' (Jickling and Spork, 1998: 312). This leads directly to the question of whether 'environmental education' and 'education for sustainable development' and 'education for sustainability' are all the same thing.

From Jickling and Spork's analysis it is possible to conclude that arguments over definitions will become detached from the sources which inspired them. In this sense definitional arguments can be superficial, open to sophistry and may fail to address root causes. There are two lessons to be learnt from Jickling and Spork's critique. The first is that theoretical underpinnings from which practice is drawn must be made explicit; the second, is found in the warning of Clayton and Radcliffe (1996: 15) that 'all theories are approximations to the truth, with a certain domain of validity'. Throughout the remainder of this chapter I am guided by May's (1997) view that theory should be employed for its greater or lesser relevance. Furthermore, theory should not be seen as singular and coherent but pluralistic, contextual and appropriate. Amidst this complexity Orr (1992) outlines his vision for education. He suggests a 'paradigm shift' (as described in Chapter Two) is necessary in order that the contradictory claims relating to sustainable development can be properly addressed. Most importantly, he suggests that the 'crisis of sustainability and the problems of education are in large measure a crisis of knowledge' (Orr, 1992: 155). In this Orr shares with Jickling and Spork (1998) the view that the resolution of claims is a second order construct. This is because, as things stand, conflict resolution works within a dominant paradigm. It is not enough therefore to think about the issues of sustainable development, there must also be an understanding of the paradigm itself (this is the same as the concept of the funnel developed in Chapter Nine). The challenge therefore is to identify first order constructs. In this respect Orr (1992) asks what it is that people need to know in order for them to make this transition from one paradigm to another.

If this transition is a serious proposition then education has a multiple role in the cultivation of such knowledge (Reason, 1998). The first is to encourage dialogue about the issues of sustainability (in keeping with the socially critical educators and the deep ecologists). The second is to deal with the way society and the education establishment itself thinks about and deals with these issues. In this way theoretical positions themselves become the sources of study (in keeping with Jickling and Spork's (1998) concern to reveal unexamined assumptions surrounding theoretical constructs in relation to their practical application). The third role is to engage pupils in ideas which will demonstrate 'the political, social, and above all, the economic influences on the process of paradigm creation and maintenance' (Orr, 1992: 143). In summary the challenge is not simply to understand knowledge alone but to understand the social construction of knowledge. This is precisely the epistemological position developed in Chapter Two and is central to this developing critique I am setting out on the basis of Reason's (1998) framework.

This philosophical perspective has strategic policy support from the Secretary of State

for Scotland's Advisory Group on Education for Sustainable Development (reported in Cairngorms Partnership, 2000: 5) which stated that:

The purpose of education for sustainable development is to equip people with the skills, knowledge and understanding to help them to take better informed decisions, whether corporately on behalf of others or individually in their own lives, and to act in ways which are consistent with a sustainable future.

This statement shares curricular similarities with the *5-14 Environmental Studies* document which states 'pupils should gradually develop positive attitudes towards the environment and a personal code of environmental values' (SOED, 1993a: 44-45).

I would like now to discuss my primary data in relation to this theoretical and strategic policy background. In doing so my research strategy follows the same line of reasoning as the preceding chapter. What I am trying to understand is each centre's own micro-paradigm or organisational ethos which acts as a filter to either legitimate or exclude certain ideas or forms of practice. This exercise is in keeping with the point Smyth, *et al.* (1997) make that despite the global recognition and acceptance that problems exist, little thought is given to who will carry out the educational practice. Therefore, I now pose the question:

What can outdoor education do for sustainable living?

What makes this an interesting research issue is the apparent reluctance of outdoor education to respond to education and sustainable development. For example, at a Royal Geographic Society conference entitled *Environmental Education, Ethics, and Citizenship* (1998) it was reported that 'the potential for outdoor education to deliver (sustainable development) outcomes is still largely unknown and underdeveloped'. Also Chapters Five, Six, Seven, Eight and Nine of this thesis show that instructors believe their work to be firmly located in outcomes related to personal and social development and outdoor activities. Since the discussion shows little correspondence between personal and social development and environmental education, what I have shown therefore is that the practice at my research sites takes no cognisance of the developing ideas relating to sustainable development.

Bearing in mind the contradictory claims relating to sustainable development, I envisaged that if I relied solely on the technique of interviewing to gather data the interviewee and I would quickly become bogged down in definitional issues. Since I have demonstrated the polemical traps inherent in these definitions this meant finding a way of getting beyond the superficial. The method I chose to do this was to send each

principal a one week programme (which I will refer to as 'the programme') in advance. I stated it was a course designed to be run at an outdoor centre with sustainable development outcomes in mind.

The programme consisted of:

1. a cover letter
2. principles of sustainable development
3. ethical principles
4. the mandate for outdoor education and sustainable development
5. principles of learning
6. timetable.

In circulating this programme in advance I was not trying to establish the state of knowledge about sustainability. However, I was setting in motion a process identified by Harvey (1995: 206) where 'the starting point is the selection of desired outcomes of Agenda 21. These are then translated into educational objectives. The latter then form the basis for educational programmes'. What I set out to achieve was first; establish the extent of agreement regarding what sustainable development is; second, establish the extent of disagreement; third, establish the extent to which centres already deliver this type of course (or elements of it); and lastly, establish the extent to which centres are able to fully implement the programme in a focussed manner. The programme was introduced by the following letter.

Dear (Principal),

The next stage of my research will be looking at the relationship between outdoor education and sustainable development. Overleaf I have provided some statements and principles. These demonstrate that outdoor education has a role in this wider debate and could, in the near future, be asked to provide suitable programmes.

However, the question remains what would a programme of outdoor education for sustainable development look like? What would be its guiding principles, its content and how would this relate to existing programmes?

I would like to explore this by *adopting the assumption* that this centre has been asked, by either a client group, head teacher or your local authority, to deliver a programme to meet the criteria of sustainable development. I have provided a set of principles relating to both learning and sustainable development. These are for your own use prior to the interview.

On the day of the interview I will bring along a one week programme and set of learning outcomes. The interview will thus have two core themes.

The first will be a discussion of the programme itself; and second, the suitability of the underpinning principles. The interview itself is designed in such a way that *principals will be asked to identify the opportunities that such a programme represents together with the limitations of what can genuinely be expected of a five day programme with Primary 6/7 school children.*

The second item of the programme referred to principles of sustainable development. By introducing these I was seeking to demonstrate that these are not simply my ideas but are recognised by national and international organisations. This is why I have stated the principles and then included the references.

Sustainable development is based on sets of principles and ethics and have been developed as follows:

Principles of sustainable development

- 'All human activity is ultimately dependent upon the environment, its natural resources and processes'.
- 'Our interactions with our environment and its natural processes are so complex that it is often difficult to predict the consequences of our activities'.

Scottish Natural Heritage (1993)

- 'Respect and care for the community of life'.
- 'Improve the quality of human life'.
- 'Minimise the depletion of resources'.

International Union for the Conservation of Nature (1991)

The third item of the programme referred to ethical principles. By introducing these I was seeking to explore the concept of education as either a normative or value-free concept. Without necessarily imposing these principles as the correct ones I would be trying to establish each principal's views of the relationship between ethics and education. In addition I was trying to establish if this type of programme would be something that centres would be good at.

Ethical principles

'Intergenerational Equity - we should do nothing which puts at risk the natural environment's ability to meet the needs, both material and non-material, of future generations'.

'Societal Equity - one sector of society should not exploit natural resources nor damage the environment at the expense of another'.

'Inter-Species Equity - we should respect other life forms: rarely, if ever, are we justified in driving them to extinction for our own purposes'.

Scottish Natural Heritage (1993)

In case the relationship between outdoor education and sustainable development was

not apparent I wanted to demonstrate a connection. I sought to demonstrate this through a policy cascade presenting an international perspective, a national perspective and how these perspectives indicated a role for outdoor education. Again, so as this was not simply seen as my own ideas, I accompanied the chosen statements with references.

The Mandate for Outdoor Education and Sustainable Development

There are now a series of international and national documents from Governments and Non-Governmental Organisations which call on all sectors of society to consider and implement the principles of sustainable development.

The United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (the Rio Summit) stated: 'Education is critical for promoting sustainable development'.

Agenda 21, 1992

In response the United Kingdom has stated: 'The Government has pledged that concern for the environment will be at the heart of policy making. Education will be given the highest possible priority. If people are to play their full part in achieving a sustainable future, they need to know how their actions at home and at work affect the environment'.

John Prescott, Deputy Prime Minister, 1999

In an *Action Plan* the Scottish Parliament has been called on to develop 'a comprehensive co-ordinated strategy to promote education for sustainable development, embracing all areas of Government activity, with committed political and administrative leadership, sufficient resourcing and effective monitoring'.

Advisory Group on Education for Sustainable Development, 1999

A sharper focus on the relationship between sustainable development and education is provided in the following statement:

'Over the next few years you will hear less about Environmental Education and much more about Education for Sustainable Development (ESD). What is the difference? Environmental Education is essentially education about the environment with an implicit hope that children will develop the skills and attitudes to enable them to make informed decisions about environmental issues'.

Royal Society for the Protection of Birds, 1999

'ESD contains all of the content of Environmental Education but starts from the aim of people altering their behaviour to achieve sustainable living, i.e. living in a way that does not deplete non-renewable resources which will be needed by future generations. It acknowledges that people are the problem and the solution to most environmental problems and recognises that economic, political, social and cultural behaviour have a big

part to play in sustainable living'.
Royal Society for the Protection of Birds, 1999

Certain organisations have identified outdoor education as an appropriate means of delivering sustainable development.
World Wide Fund For Nature 1995; Scottish Environmental Education Council, 1998

The final component of the programme was about principles of learning. As the previous chapters show, the principles of learning on which outdoor education practice is based are difficult to identify. In presenting this programme package for discussion I wanted to demonstrate that this programme was based on explicit principles. The discussion could then revolve around whether or not they were appropriate. To add credibility to the principles, I have used the work of Luckner and Nadler (1992) which I modified and added to for the specific purpose of this exercise. They were presented thus:

Principles of Learning

1. Pupils should be actively involved in their learning
2. Pupils should learn through the direct experience of 'real' issues and making connections
3. Through 'systemic' thinking pupils should be encouraged to think of relationships and not just parts
4. Throughout the learning process, pupils are actively engaged in posing questions, investigating, experimenting, being curious, solving problems, assuming responsibility, being creative, and constructing meaning
5. People do not necessarily talk in terms of 'right' or 'wrong'. What they say can be considered as an expressions of values
6. Emphasis should therefore be directed at the assumptions which underpin questions and answers
7. Pupils should be encouraged to explore what values mean for them and why
8. Programmes should cater for the affective, cognitive and physical domains
9. The residential experience provides pupils with an opportunity to consider their own lives from a different perspective
10. Educators must recognise and encourage spontaneous opportunities for learning
11. Educators strive to be aware of their biases, judgments, and pre-conceptions and how they influence the learner
12. Pupils will have the opportunity to recognise how institutional, social and cultural factors may cause people to act in ways that contradict personal and professional intentions
13. Content links theory to practice relating the pupil's experience to school, home, community and wider society.

Principles 4, 10, 11 and 12 from Luckner and Nadler (1992)

The programme package, including the timetable I am about to present, is based on

Reason's (1998) four point epistemology, presented in Chapter Two, which recognises four discrete areas of knowledge (experiential, presentational, propositional and practical). This programme was designed to draw explicitly on all four of these in the integrated manner that Reason (1998) intended. In developing the programme package I am providing a platform for discussion. However, the questions are framed in such a way that the platform itself is open for discussion. I am not simply trying to discuss the potential learning outcomes so much as engage with the underlying theories and assumptions and the operational ability of each centre to implement the programme.

Each principal received this six part programme package at least one week before the interview date. Between the letter arriving and the interview date I phoned to ensure that the programme had arrived reminding the principals that the interview depended on them having read it. The timetable was not sent to the principals in advance for two reasons. The first is a practical issue in that I felt principals were being asked to do enough already in having to read the other five parts. The second is a methodological issue. I felt that presenting the timetable in advance would allow any principal who might be resistant to the idea the opportunity to prepare a defence. I trialled the idea and found that the principal of the pilot centre did not feel disadvantaged by not having the timetable in advance whilst I felt satisfied that I achieved my own interview aims in developing an open discussion of the content. The timetable that I used can be seen on the following page.

Table 4: A Programme Relating Outdoor Education and Sustainable Development

DAY	AM	PM	EVENING
MONDAY	ARRIVAL	INTRODUCTORY ACTIVITY Instructor/Group Familiarisation The Cultural and Historical Landscape LO 2, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11	EXPLANATION OF THE CENTRE AS A LIVING COMMUNITY By the End of the Week You Will... Exploration of Values and Attitudes LO 4, 8, 9, 10, 11
TUESDAY	FIELD STUDY LO 2, 3, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11	CREDIT SHOPPING FOR CAMPING Food Cycle Analysis: from soil to plate Nutrition LO 2, 4, 8, 10, 11	CAMPING OR BOTHY Solitary Moments Night Walk LO 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11
WEDNESDAY	DECAMP AND DEBRIEF LO 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11	CONSERVATION PROJECT Local Group, F.C. Estate, Landowner LO 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11	COMMUNITY STUDY Visit or be Visited LO 1, 2, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11
THURSDAY	CASE STUDY Thematic Study Involving Political, Social and Environmental Aspects of Landscape - How does this affect you and how do you affect it? LO 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11		VIDEO AND DISCUSSION LO as appropriate
FRIDAY	THE AESTHETIC LANDSCAPE LO 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11	DEBRIEF, FOLLOW ON, DEPART Reflection on all other LO's	

Appended to the timetable were the following outcomes. Each activity is designed to achieve certain outcomes which are recorded in the timetable as a learning outcome (LO). Those in bold indicate a primary outcome specific to that activity whilst those not in bold are secondary outcomes which overlap between activities. They represent the anticipated learning outcomes which would arise out of this programme of outdoor education and sustainable development.

Learning Outcomes (Short Term)

Pupils will:

1. be involved in a practical conservation project
2. have completed activities which look at the relationship between economic, social, cultural and political factors which relate to the environment
3. have carried out a field study experiment followed by laboratory analysis
4. have considered the life cycle analysis of food production and distribution and its environmental impact
5. have experienced brief moments of solitude
6. have experienced the changing patterns of day and night from a tent / bothy
7. have experienced within the environment qualities such as imagination, beauty and awe
8. have been encouraged to respect the environment
9. have been part of a living and interdependent community
10. have been part of a 'whole institution' approach to outdoor education and sustainable development
11. be encouraged to think of 'follow on'.

The learning outcomes which have been highlighted on the timetable may be described as the Main Outcomes of that particular programme component.

I have developed this programme to be used as a way getting around the definitional quicksand that surrounds the terms environment, environmental education, sustainability, sustainable development and education for sustainable development (Smyth, 1995). In this I am guided by Smyth, *et al.* (1997: 175) who state 'education has to be expressed in terms of processes and objectives rather than as a corpus of approved knowledge'. This statement lends justification to the programme I have developed. It begins to look at *what* a programme might consist of and aim towards. What follows is the likelihood of this programme being incorporated into the work of local authority residential outdoor education centres.

The research strategy was to discuss the programme and educational principles with each principal. These interviews lasted between one and one and a half hours. The interviews were recorded and fully transcribed. Data from the transcripts were coded under the headings:

- Knowledge of sustainable development
- The appropriateness of outdoor education to deliver sustainable development
- Managing change
- Resources
- Staff training
- Staff interest
- Extra work for centre staff
- Economics
- Whole-centre approach to sustainable development
- Environmental policy
- Building construction
- Purchasing
- External barriers
- Tensions between departments
- Organisational culture
- Good practice
- Visiting teachers' perceptions
- Pupils' perceptions
- Power and politics.

This coding system is used in the text below to allow analysis of each heading. By discussing the opportunities and barriers to implementation, the area I sought to explore was the role of local authority residential outdoor education centres in relation to sustainable development.

Knowledge of Sustainable Development

A research project investigating sustainable practice and the scope of environmental education at outdoor education centres predicted that both were set to increase (Wooton, *et al.*, 1995). Five years later my own thesis shows the increase is not apparent in certain areas of the public sector. This may be because there has been no increase. However, focussing on this aspect conceals a fundamental problem. What Wooton, *et al.*, (1995) failed to do was establish benchmarks as to what is meant by the term 'environmental education'. There is an implicit assumption that it is something with a common and homogeneous definition. Consequently, issues of reliability and validity conspire to challenge the findings. It would appear that the ideas associated with this terminology, contrary to the findings of Wooton, *et al.* (1995) suggest the potential for divergent understandings between the researcher and the researched with little more understanding as to whether there is a gain, or even loss, of provision. The primary task therefore is not to *begin* with measurement but, in keeping with the view of Smyth, *et al.* (1997) to define and make explicit that which is to be measured. Thus,

it is the difference between the way in which centres use, define and operationalise terms in relation to the range of terminology developing globally (and independently of outdoor centres) that forms the basis of the data to come.

The interview data in this chapter relates only to centre principals. To avoid verbosity (e.g. 'the principal of Beinn Dearg') I will adopt the convention of referring to principals by their centre pseudonym.

The principals' responses indicated a tenuous relationship between the concept of sustainable development, their own knowledge of it, and how it might relate to outdoor education. For example, Beinn Dearg stated that 'the difficulty (is) born out of a lack of knowledge as opposed to a lack of desire to do it'. Beinn Dearg found it challenging to think of global issues in relation to the immediate learning context and he suggested 'there needs to be some model'. This is a common symptom of confusion which Parry and Scott (ESRC, 1997: 3) suggests arises out of the 'failure to see that global problems are generally the result of cumulative individual actions'. However, Beinn Dearg was comfortable in recognising the inexactness of his own knowledge. This finding is entirely in keeping with Barr's (1998: 25) view that 'sustainable development is a difficult concept to grasp...unsurprisingly public understanding of the concept is poor'.

This openness was not apparent in all cases and what began to develop was a tendency to dwell on the known as opposed to exploring the unknown. One trend common to all five was the tendency to talk from the perspective of what Smyth, *et al.* (1997: 175) and Baczala (1992) refer to as the 'green' environment. For example, it was about avoiding tramping over rare plants (Beinn Dearg), not disturbing a bird reserve (Ladhar Bheinn), taking care to limit erosion at an abseil site (An Teallach), creating wildlife habitats (Lochnagar) and instructing pupils that litter can be harmful to wildlife (Carn an Fhithleir). What the interview programme made clear is the 'green' environment is only part of the educational intent and must be seen in relation to social, political and economic dimensions in keeping with Marshall (1995) and Smyth (1998). There remains therefore a gap between understanding the 'green' environment (where it is perceived as a problem) and the pedagogical implication of a programme which addresses the tensions inherent in the relationship between the 'green' environment and human beings.

This finding indicates that communication with the principals will depend on engaging with theoretical issues which immediately presents barriers. For example, having read the programme An Teallach found the 'ethical principles' 'high falutin' but nevertheless welcomed the programme saying, 'we don't have the time to dress it up in

fancy theories but we know what we want to do and think, oh that is what we are actually doing...It is quite nice to have a formal justification for what we are doing'. In this way An Teallach adopts the position that the role of theory is to support what they are already doing. However, this fails to acknowledge that the education in question is transformative (O'Sullivan, 1999). To welcome justification for something that is already done merely reinforces present practice. It also promotes resistance to change preventing transition from present circumstances to whatever social ends education is chosen to serve (Orr, 1992). In other words to maintain present practices is to assume that the social ends have already been decided and have sufficient justification to warrant continuance. As I have pointed out throughout this thesis, from a deep ecology perspective, this is not the case. An extension of this problem can be seen in Beinn Dearg's call for a guiding model. It is worth bearing in mind Harvey's (1995) view that it is not simply models which are needed since they do not indicate priorities, strategic direction nor start points. Models without attached theoretical underpinning should be viewed with suspicion since they can 'cause the unfocussed to lose direction' (Harvey, 1995: 203).

Rather than theory and principles being 'high falutin', a theoretical understanding of the issues can now be seen as pivotal because of the misunderstanding that arises in its absence. This is quite clearly exemplified in An Teallach's insistence that the *Earthkeepers* course they deliver covers sustainable development. This is not completely true. As I have made clear in Chapter Seven *Earthkeepers* is only part of the picture and it fails to address adequately the social, political and economic issues which *Agenda 21* (UNCED, 1992) identifies as central features. One example which clearly illustrates this was when the same principal told me 'in this environment there are better things to teach than pollution because being so far down a single track road you do not have the same consequences as the overuse of transport in the city'. In terms of sustainable development this is unsound reasoning. It is unsound because atmospheric cycles unite the urban conurbation with the rural. It is also unsound because pupils who visit the centre will return to their urban homes where their countryside experience is only part of their lives' experiences. This part therefore is not representative of their normal lives. Consequently, it is not conducive to thinking about sustainable development in ways which maintain the dichotomies between the rural and urban; the green environment and the human-made world.

In trying to present a programme of activities unifying theory and practice I found that principals would adopt elements of it to legitimise their *existing* practice. An Teallach's principal suggested that 'instead of doing personal and social development through adventurous activities we could do personal and social development through sustainable development'. Similarly, Beinn Dearg thought that elements of the programme

represented 'another string to the bow' which resonates with An Teallach's statement that 'a week at the centre is a combination of a lot of things'. These statements are indicative of an unfocussed approach to programming which takes little cognisance of theoretical concerns, particularly those relating to an ecological ontology.

The principals nevertheless voice legitimate concerns. I am using their concerns to establish a doorway to this concept of sustainable development rather than the validity of the concerns themselves. Through coming to terms with the theoretical implications of running this programme, I am attempting to manoeuvre the discussion to the position where they have to, inadvertently, discuss their personal views on the nature of outdoor education. In this indirect manner I am seeking to establish the appropriateness, ability and enthusiasm of principals to deliver this programme. If I were to rely solely on a direct approach such as 'can you deliver this programme?' the answer 'yes' or 'no' would not explain why.

The Appropriateness of Outdoor Education to Deliver Sustainable Development

The ability to deliver the programme elicits a mixed response. Beinn Dearg stated 'I don't think that we could actually deliver a programme thoroughly enough to meet the objectives'. Ladhar Bheinn asked 'why should it (sustainable development) be done through outdoor education...I am not convinced that outdoor education is better placed to do something about it than English, social education, biology and history'. However, unlike these centres, An Teallach agreed in principle but warned 'it can be difficult with Primary Six and Primary Seven, you have got to be careful not to confuse the kids, so keep things fairly simple and not too negative, it mustn't be doom and gloom, they need to see that they can do something positive'. Whilst recognising this concern there is evidence that pupils are able to engage in concepts that are far from simple. For example, there is an expectation in the 5-14 curricular guidelines for primary four to primary six pupils to be able to understand 'the importance of conservation and the value of re-cycling materials' (SOED, 1993a: 17). These particular outcomes are aimed at pupils younger than those to whom the principal is referring. Furthermore, research with 8 year olds and 11 year olds shows that children can process complicated environmental issues earlier and more comprehensively than previous research had shown (Wylie *et al.*, 1998; Sheehy *et al.*, 2000). An Teallach also felt that this type of education is inherently pessimistic. Whilst recognising this as a problem, Smyth (1995: 10) states that it can be overcome by taking proactive approaches 'aiming to prevent problems arising rather than cleaning up afterwards'. This would require An Teallach to undertake a shift in perception to the point where 'it is not enough to see the environment as posing a problem...we must move to a positive recognition and appreciation of the environment as a source of life and well-being and joy' (Rodger, 1993: 11).

Moving from perceptions of pupils' abilities to staff abilities, Lochnagar was concerned that 'systemic thinking would be new to outdoor educators' (for a fuller explanation of systemic, sometimes called holistic thinking, see Orr, 1993; Marshall, 1995; Reid, 1995; Smyth, 1995). A sharp distinction must be made therefore between Beinn Dearg and Ladhar Bheinn who argued against the programme in principle, and An Teallach and Lochnagar who accepted the principles of the programme but were concerned about implementation.

Paradoxically, it was Carn an Fhithleir, who earlier claimed to have no involvement in environmental education, that was most enthusiastic to support it. Carn an Fhithleir stated 'there are some grouse and deer estates around here where we could get involved in the local community...the economic, social and cultural dimensions can be linked together during a walk'. Carn an Fhithleir also knew gamekeepers and farmers who could talk about their livelihood with the pupils. The centre grounds comprise 150 acres. Within this there are nest boxes, access to shore and heath, deciduous woodland and managed forestry. The centre could run a programme in the grounds for 90 pupils in ten groups and, in the words of Carn An Fhithleir, 'not have to turn a key in a minibus'. In summary Carn an Fhithleir stated, 'this programme is quite achievable'.

I suggested to Carn an Fhithleir that the *potential* for delivering a course was very different from actually implementing it. In response Carn an Fhithleir stated that they had delivered a six day programme quite similar just recently (albeit with secondary school pupils). It had cross-curricular aspects such as art, history, geography, biology and an overnight out-of-doors. The centre catered for 60 people camping including two groups sailing, two open-canoeing and sea kayaking and two walking. The school teachers delivered the technical aspects with assistance from the instructors. They did a river study, from source to sea. The equipment needed for the river study was supplied by the school. In other activities the pupils had the opportunity to measure light and the pH of soil.

What this example shows is that without a history of delivering such a programme the centre nevertheless managed to do it. It is instructive to note that the enthusiasm for the programme was driven by one of the school's senior teachers. It is an example which shows that centres can respond to external demands to operate new programmes based on educational principles (in this instance to meet curricular needs).

External pressure such as this may well represent a pre-requisite for introducing this type of programme. Such pressure would have to deal with the perception at centres that there is a 'correct' location in which outdoor education takes place. One example of this would be in the paragraph above where a whole programme could take place

within the centre grounds. At the other end of the spectrum is the view that outdoor education takes place away from the centre. Beinn Dearg represented this former view by asking this hypothetical question from a pupil's perspective: 'why are we hanging around the centre? We have come to the centre to explore...we could end up doing a programme where we do not move away from the centre, we orienteer here, we canoe here, we can cycle here, we can go for a walk up the back'. Consequently delivery can be dictated and hampered, not by the principles of the programme but a deterministic belief that outdoor education should take place in a location dictated by an inherited value system which favours one location over another.

Another dimension is the idea where principals believe they are already operating within the domain of sustainable development. Despite initial protest at outdoor education having no specific role to play, Ladhar Bheinn was happy to concede that 'attitudes, the case study, the aesthetic landscape, camping overnight, field studies and solitary moments are features of existing programmes'. However, there is no evidence to suggest it is done in the focussed manner in keeping with education for sustainable development. Fragments of ideas are being used to represent a joined up picture. At the heart of this are the different perspectives that principals bring to their understanding of the role of outdoor education. For example, Lochnagar stated that 'if it was only sustainable development as the focus there would be no problem, but centres may also be looking at literacy (and) citizenship,...(schools) might be trying to meet science or geography attainment targets. Will centres see this as just another pressure?' Similarly, Beinn Dearg stated 'there is so much...everything from social inclusion to curricular issues...the outdoor education label gets pushed on to'. This was a point made some time before by Crowther (1988: 13) who stated, 'there are no doubt too many aims and claims in outdoor education, to be attainable by any one teacher or to be verifiable by investigation'. This is more firmly established when considering Beinn Dearg's statement that 'we can get away with what we are doing today because the programme is so broad-based but if you are talking about bringing things down to narrower issues...'. It would appear that rhetoric revolves around claims which are very general and broad based as opposed to focussing on the substance and specificity of the claims.

This lack of specificity dictates the nature of the language used and the manner in which it is used. For example, defending outdoor education from this broad perspective allows principals to make broad claims. One of these, agreed by all principals, is that there is a direct relationship between sustainable development and personal and social development. The connection is assumed to be that both are to do with values. Whilst acknowledging that there can be a relationship between the two, the point here is that the conjunction is not presented from a coherent position with

theoretical justification. Instead a form of rhetoric is used which provides an image of conjunction which is not necessarily theoretically grounded. Lochnagar showed some sympathy with this analysis suggesting, 'some things are easier to do than others to meet these principles, but values would be harder to draw out'. The issue, therefore, is not whether sustainable development and personal and social development are conjoined; the real issue is, which values are they supposed to represent? Once the values have been made explicit then, for Carr (1999), the task for education is a matter of communicating those values. In adopting this assumption as a working principle I am suggesting that it is impossible not to teach about values for it is a value laden position itself to decide to teach, or not to teach, about them. Recognising the enormity of making explicit personal and organisational hidden assumptions relating to values, Carn an Fhithleir stated 'there is so much more work needs to be done'.

In this respect Lochnagar provided an appraisal of the current situation suggesting, 'centres generally are not delivering consciously on sustainable development but do deliver parts'. In terms of the current situation this statement provides an overview of the position of the other four principals. There is also an acknowledgement that outdoor education can respond more effectively but the willingness, ability and extent (i.e. the difference between a piecemeal approach and an integrated one) remains different from centre to centre. If centres were to move from their current position towards delivering this programme then it is clear that centre principals will be involved in managing a process of change.

Managing Change

Hudson (1995: 188) observes it is an ironic truth that many organisations, committed as they are to change and development, are extraordinarily conservative when it comes to changing themselves'. The Scottish Office document *Down to Earth* (1999: 9) states 'education prepares people for change, which is an essential and inevitable component of sustainable development'. These two statements highlight the tension inherent in a teaching approach which embraces change from within an organisation which does not. Fullan (1991) distinguishes between two forms. First order changes 'are those that improve the efficiency and effectiveness of what is currently done' whereas second order changes 'seek to alter the fundamental ways in which organisations are put together, including new goals structures, and roles...' (Fullan, 1991: 29). Since the goals of sustainable development tend towards second order changes there is an issue as to the extent centres are willing and able to do so.

I asked Lochnagar if it is asking too much of centres to change? Lochnagar does push for minor changes all of the time...'it is a question of gradual change and more long-term systems. We are dealing with short-term politics and financing and that is the problem. Most centres are on a knife edge of survival but lots of things can be done as

your list shows. We have tackled the packaging and there is some things more easy to tackle than others'. In response to the same question Carn an Fhìdhleir stated 'it is better to tweak'. Clearly Lochnagar and Carn an Fhìdhleir are operating on the basis of first order change where the integrity of existing structures, goals and roles remain unchallenged. It is for these reasons that An Teallach stated 'it would be difficult to do sustainable development alone, but do sustainable development through personal and social development or vice versa we wouldn't be throwing one out'. Once again the idea of sustainable development is welcomed so long as it can be fitted in with current operations.

Beinn Dearg stated 'I couldn't walk into a staff meeting tomorrow and say, 'right guys were going down the sustainable development road, this is the policies we're going to pursue, this is the teaching and learning outcomes that we're going to follow, there's the package'. Similarly, Lochnagar stated 'I would have difficulty, even in a centre which is fairly receptive to new ideas introducing a programme such as this. Just because it represents such a big level of change and rethinking'. Carn an Fhìdhleir reflected on the time and motivation necessary stating 'with the work we are doing at the moment the energy and the focus to change, and manage that change, isn't there and so practice is not as I would wish it to be'.

The evidence suggests that changes will not happen overnight. However, this does not mean that centres are unwilling to change. Carn an Fhìdhleir stated 'there are many possibilities within the current programme, but we would aspire to a similar programme such as that. We would work towards it in small steps'. I asked Lochnagar if this is the sort of programme that outdoor centres could or should be doing? Lochnagar responded that 'there is a step in between, an awareness raising stage where centres adapt their existing programmes and realise that they can do a lot within those and that would be a step in this direction'. This suggests that, for outdoor education centres, there is a stage in between Fullan's (1991) first and second order changes. Perhaps the two changes should be viewed not in the context of their degree of order so much as the transition between the two. In this way change could be seen as gradual and incremental and occurring over an extended period.

However timescale is only one of the factors which affect the scope of change. Outdoor education centres play host to a range of individuals and agencies each with different demands. In this respect there are pupils, visiting teachers, local authorities, elected council members, teaching institutions and other training organisations which prepare instructors for the work-place. It is in recognition of this that organisational change cannot occur in isolation of external agencies, a point in keeping with Fullan's (1991) analysis that significant change is accomplished by pursuing multiple lines

simultaneously.

Resources

Accepting that the transition towards a programme of sustainable development necessarily requires the management of such change, it is important to recognise the parameters in which change is to take place. Beinn Dearg stated 'to deliver a programme like this will be all consuming for the agency that is delivering it...it would be something that would eat into our resources'. This statement found agreement with the other four principles. However, Beinn Dearg's concerns went one step further stating 'running a local authority centre, this centre, I could not deliver that programme it would cost too much'.

The cost that Beinn Dearg referred to is the salary needed to deploy instructors overnight on camping duties. The financial cost is complicated. Beinn Dearg has already stopped offering camping because the existing staff contracts were not flexible enough to incorporate the additional hours required for overnights. For example, an instructor's week would include an overnight duty (a centre duty) on one night and another overnight to camp. At this point, Beinn Dearg stated, instructors would have virtually worked their full weeks hours and under EC directives should be given the rest of the week off. Quite what the full implications of this statement are in terms of contractual agreements remains unclear. The terms and conditions of employees appear to vary from one local authority to the next. However, all principals stated that staffing and cost acted as a barrier to implementing the programme. However, not all saw the staffing issue as insurmountable as Beinn Dearg did.

Referring to staffing and cost Carn an Fhithleir stated 'I would get round that because it is what I believe in and the instructors value that. It would be balancing the instructors work with the outcomes'. At this juncture I pointed out the difficulty that other centres had. Carn an Fhithleir responded 'we are very lucky in that we can write the terms and conditions for working hours. There are innovative ways around that in arranging staff hours, it is not a barrier'. It is important to acknowledge that the funding sources and ownership of these two operations (Beinn Dearg and Carn an Fhithleir) are very different. To what extent this influences the way in which they have responded is beyond the scope of this thesis. For the moment, however, this finding indicates that there is a different degree of willingness from centre to centre to implement the proposed programme. All principals suggested that there are many possibilities within current programmes. There is no consensus suggesting that all principals aspired to this particular programme as a whole, but there was a willingness, in all cases, to work towards it in small steps. What is common to all of the centres is that they believed that outdoor education does have a role in sustainable development.

What remains unresolved is whether principals felt able to implement the programme as a whole, and at once; or, in parts, over time.

Staff Training

All principals believed that to implement a programme of sustainable development requires staff training. There was common agreement that the theoretical understanding, particularly relating to 'ethical principles' and 'principles of sustainable development' is not found within current staff knowledge. Carn an Fhìdhleir stated 'we do not know enough about sustainable development ourselves'. Ladhair Bheinn stated 'there would be enough experience to get away with it and you would build on it over time'. The way in which principals talk of staff training provided an insight into two different approaches relating to managing change. There is one view that training should be in-house and another that it should be external. As a proponent of the former Ladhair Bheinn stated 'I don't think it would be a case of sending people on a course. It is about changing attitudes and changing the culture of the centre'. Inherent in this position is that it is not simply about teaching issues but the organisational ethos in which teaching takes place. This issue is covered more fully in the section headed 'organisational cultures' below. The other four principals suggested that the knowledge does not rest in-house and so external training would be needed. The amount they would be prepared to pay was not discussed but the principle that they would be prepared to pay something is established.

However, perhaps the greatest barrier to this issue is not the cost of training but the nature of what is currently perceived to be 'legitimate' staff training. Lochnagar stated, instructors 'would ideally require training although they would not necessarily see that (sustainable development) as a priority. Staff often see "hard skills" training as a priority'. Consequently, as Carn an Fhìdhleir states, '(there would be problems) doing staff training which is not so traditionally outdoor oriented'. These findings are in keeping with a questionnaire survey of local authority residential outdoor education centres in Scotland which found that staff training concentrated on the the personal proficiency of instructors in outdoor activities (Nicol, 1999). Accepting the shift of perception necessary to implement this programme Carn an Fhìdhleir suggested, what is needed 'is a culture change. There is sufficient interest here in the centre at the moment, there is some expertise but we need somebody external to mentor us throughout the change i.e. we are not told how to do this but we own it and we own the changes and then we will be happy to talk to anybody'.

Staff Interest

If instructors construe staff training in terms of hard skill development the wider issue then arises as to the extent of enthusiasm for something not considered as traditional.

Bearing in mind Carn an Fhìdhleir's claim that the whole of this programme could be operated from within the centre grounds I asked if that creates a problem with the instructors wanting to get out into the wider countryside. Carn an Fhìdhleir responded 'I would not wish to take away the busses and run everything on site because there is an issue of motivating the instructors'. The enthusiasm and motivation of instructors therefore is central to this programme succeeding. Responding to this issue Lochnagar stated 'you might have a conversion job to do as some staff would not see the relevance of their work to sustainable development'. Ladhair Beinn stated 'if I look at my own staff there would be a genuine concern for the environment, but people would pay lip service to living lightly. When you try to get people to recycle bottles (they) are lazy and selfish'.

The evidence therefore is that staff interest would be variable. Beinn Dearg suggested 'if you were to interview a cross section of the staff you would end up with a varied response to this issue. There are those who would pay lip service because it is something to keep them in a job but ok if that's the way we have got to go...There are those who say "we should have done this donkeys years ago" and there will be others saying "another initiative; why can't we just get out there and walk"...'. Corroboration of this diversity comes from Lochnagar who stated 'an introductory walk for one (instructor) can be a march around whilst another might incorporate a lot of these principles. It is highly dependent on the leader with the group and possibly the visiting member of staff'.

There was also concern expressed that with so little camping actually taking place at present that the reintroduction of it might create attitudinal problems for those instructors not wanting to spend a night out. This led Lochnagar to conclude 'you would have more success with this programme if you developed the centre with like minded people and you were running it yourself, it was not institutionalised, without restraints, so maybe the small private centre would be better'.

Extra Work for Centre Staff

The culture change necessary for the transition to this programme would create new demands on staff time. The build up of knowledge and resources would impinge on what principals already feel is a tight schedule for them in terms of meeting existing programme requirements, particularly since under-staffing is perceived to be an issue (which Lochnagar pragmatically sees as a normal problem in centres). All principals agreed with Lochnagar that the issue of staying open is a key management issue. This is hardly surprising given the findings of a recent survey which showed that from the fifteen local authority residential outdoor education centres operating in Scotland in 1996 only nine remained in 1998 (Nicol, 1999). This elicits responses from one

extreme where Beinn Dearg stated 'I basically don't think I've got the time to do it', to Carn an Fhithleir who stated 'that programme is quite achievable although a lot of work'.

In most cases there would be sufficient equipment within centre stores to run this programme. An Teallach would require more camping equipment with the other four being able to kit out their normal numbers for one night with some upgrading of present stocks. Given the necessary investment in terms of both time and equipment it would appear that the implementation of this programme would be better received if principals could be convinced that it is in their own interests to run them.

Economics

The true cost of running this programme is not available for a number of reasons. Each centre has a different funding arrangement with their local authorities. Instructors are on different terms and conditions from one centre to the next. There are varying arrangements over the extent to which centres are required to recover either, a percentage of operation costs, or full operating costs, or operating costs 'plus'. However the camping aspect alone indicates that this programme would cost more than running the normal multi-activity programme. Beinn Dearg provided an indication of the staffing implications of running the programme for 48 pupils on a staffing ratio of one to eight. On the basis of one overnight per group per week the annual (forty weeks) additional staff bill would cost approximately £24,000. Also, assuming current staff numbers, the overnight would mean instructors exceeding the terms of their contract regarding working hours. This would mean replacement staff being bought in at a further annual cost of £10,000. Consequently, centres would have to find £34,000 on staff costs alone. This is £34,000 more than running the existing multi-activity programme and does not include other costs such as upgrading and maintaining camping equipment. I did not have access to the salary scales on which the principal calculated these figures and so cannot guarantee their accuracy. However, if the figures are used illustratively it would appear that there are significant financial implications for running the proposed programme. Because of the semi-autonomous cost recovery operations of centres it seems likely that the course could only be run if it were either subsidised internally by prioritising resources differently; or, externally, with ring-fenced support from the local authority or some other source.

Some potential sources have already been explored. The impetus behind this has been the culture of change brought about because of financial expediency. For example, centres have begun to seek external funding from such agencies as *Investors in People*. To do this principals have learnt to manipulate their 'product'. An Teallach stated 'when we are going for money we find out what the local buzz word is and use that

from a mercenary point of view. At the moment sustainable education are the buzzwords so when I put in my applications for money from Scottish Natural Heritage and (the Local Enterprise Company) I use 'sustainable education'.

However it is possible to operate within existing resources. For example, Lochnagar has been able to implement some principles by buying local produce, purchasing a photocopier particularly because of its double sided function, creating habitats, re-using paper and establishing an environmental education forum within the local community. Even within the culture of financial stringency Lochnagar showed that changes can be made. Further evidence of this cautious and time dependent approach was found in the statement of Carn an Fhithleir who 'would pay for training, but that would be balanced against the amount of customers we could get to do this programme, it would be very much market driven'. The next part focusses on how gradual changes can be made within existing resources by relating organisational values and pedagogical issues.

Whole-Centre Approach to Sustainable Development

The Council for Environmental Education (CEE) has noted that 'young people cannot be expected to value the environment if it is obvious to them that it is not valued by the school itself' (CEE, 1996: 2). One way for the school to demonstrate its commitment is by adopting a 'whole-school' model (SOED, 1993a; Learning for Life Group, 1993). This is an approach incorporated into a variety of educational packages such as Sustainability Education in European Primary Schools (1997), Council for Environmental Education (1996) and Scottish CCC (1999). The components of the whole-school approach comprise of philosophical, pedagogical and organisational considerations (Neal and Palmer, 1990).

One example of what this process is and how it can begin is through what Van der Ryn and Cowan (1996) call 'ecological design'. This model is based on principles of sustainable development focussed entirely on minimising building construction (or renovation) impacts on the environment. In their own words 'design is a hinge that inevitably connects culture and nature through the exchange of materials, flows of energy and choice of land use' (Van der Ryn and Cowan, 1996: 8). Since three centres (Lochnagar, Beinn Dearg and Ladhar Bheinn) are all involved in (or have recently completed) major renovation work this was a particularly topical issue. The importance of the ecological design model is that it recognises the technical requirements (designing the building) and the human element (that staff are part of an 'organisational culture', a point discussed more fully below). Thus Van der Ryn and Cowan (1996: 158) make the suggestion that everyone is a designer 'making decisions about transportation, buildings, water, energy, food and waste'. The importance of this model to the whole-centre approach is twofold; firstly it embraces the concept of

empowerment in keeping with Heron's (1996) constructivist approach to decision making; second, and building on the first, by developing the design of a building based on principles of sustainable development, staff, through their everyday working practices, become actively involved in thinking through complex environmental systems.

In this constructivist manner the concept of education moves from the didactic model of instructors teaching pupils, to instructors and pupils working together in the creation of something. This is precisely what Orr (1994b) refers to in his use of the phrase 'architecture as pedagogy'. He states:

Within the design, construction, and operation of buildings is a curriculum in applied ecology. Buildings can be designed to recycle organic wastes through miniature ecosystems that can be studied and maintained by the users. Buildings can be designed to heat and cool themselves using solar energy and natural air flows. They can be designed to inform occupants of energy and resource use. They can be landscaped to provide shade, break winter winds, propagate rare plants, provide habitat for animals, and restore bits of vanished ecosystems. Buildings and landscapes, in other words, can extend our ecological imagination' (Orr, 1994b: 115).

Environmental Policy

Central to the whole-school approach is the development of an environmental policy. Inasmuch as the policy should be tailored to the needs of each individual school (CEE, 1996; Scottish CCC, 1999) and given that 'it is vital that the school's ethos is consonant with this (cross-curricular) approach' (SOED, 1993a: 5), I am suggesting that the same approach can be applied to outdoor education centres and called a 'whole-centre' policy. What this means for outdoor education instructors is that education is not just about what is done out-of-doors but incorporates the fabric of the building, energy efficiency, the systems it operates (e.g. purchasing), its inter-departmental relations, relations with its local community and overall ethos. In short if programmes of sustainable development are to be implemented the entire operation of the centre and the ethos promoted by its staff become an integral and explicit feature.

Steps towards the codification of this process began within a national context in the 1970s with the development of Environmental Management Systems (EMS). The purpose of an EMS is to provide a management tool which systematically assesses, monitors and controls an organisation's environmental performance (Barwise, 1998). Only one centre has undergone such a process. An Teallach took part in an EMAS (Eco-Management and Audit Scheme) which is a seven-step process to be followed progressively by the participating organisation. An Teallach has completed the first two steps. Step one involved establishing a written policy. Step two meant reviewing the organisations effects and impacts on the environment. This included 'an analysis

of the direct effects of the centre in terms of waste, energy, transport, supplies and purchasing; and a review of the outdoor and educational activities in relation to the grounds and the surrounding environment used during these activities' (An Teallach, 1999). An Teallach is currently engaged in step three which involves devising an action plan to bring about change and to monitor effects. An Teallach reported that the 'process of EMAS has stagnated (which has) a lot to do with staff moving on'. Steps four to seven follow a progressive route investing staff with responsibilities, target setting and monitoring, all of which ends in a public statement of the organisation's performance which is then verified by an external assessor. An Teallach, as a centre, has 'stagnated' just short of the implementation phase. From this finding it is possible to conclude that for an EMS to be successful there must be an 'ownership by all' ethos so as changes in staff are not detrimental to the developing momentum and overall progress.

There are three major disadvantages to the EMAS approach to developing an EMS. The first is the cost of bringing in external consultants. There are no figures available for the cost to An Teallach. It was set up as a pilot project with the cost being absorbed by the European Commission's LIFE Fund with the cost unknown to An Teallach. I consulted with the University of Edinburgh's Energy and Environmental Manager who estimated that the true cost for that local authority might have been between £5,000 and £8,000. Given the financial stringency centres already operate under it is unlikely that such a sum would be found to begin this process. This introduces the second disadvantage which is more a perception than economic. The remaining four principals all reported that an external verifier is likely to create a sense of disempowerment amongst staff. The third disadvantage is that the system An Teallach used did not address issues of pedagogy either in relation to the activities or in the sense of 'architecture as pedagogy' (Orr, 1994). Baczala (1992) has indicated how, in a school context, teaching issues relating to the curriculum are foundational to an environmental policy. In a higher education context (Walton *et al.*, 1997: 206) identify four key objective areas, one of which is 'a broad educational provision for students in the environmental area'. There is no reason to suggest that given some modification and interpretation these models could not be used in the context of outdoor education to evaluate teaching issues.

Given these constraints I was now concerned to see the extent to which principals might adopt an in-house approach to this issue. All five agreed in principle that a whole-centre approach would be necessary. If staff believed a programme of sustainable development was worthwhile then an in-house approach would overcome the problems of EMAS since; firstly, the cost would be reduced; and second, if staff believed in the programme there need not be a sense of disempowerment; and last, their

pedagogical expertise could be applied to write up their own programme.

Building Construction

Whether an EMS was approached from an in-house perspective, an external perspective, or some combination of the two there are certain factors which would need to be taken into account. The first of these would be to investigate the centre building. One major disadvantage that centre principals have inherited is the construction of their buildings. Of the five under investigation three of the centres are converted stone buildings and two are purpose built, largely wooden buildings constructed in the 1970s. In all cases principals report poor energy efficiency owing to lack of insulation, poor ventilation, excessive condensation, insufficient double glazing and one instance of an inefficient boiler system which does not allow thermostatically controlled heating. This means to maintain a comfortable temperature it is often necessary to overheat and because of poor ventilation windows are opened to allow the heat to escape. It could be argued that savings could be made in the long term if remedial construction addressed these energy inefficient buildings. However, principals believed that the costs necessary in the short term are prohibitive. Lochnagar summed up stating 'this is not possible in local authorities who plan from year-to-year, you can plan ahead a little bit but...'. This is precisely the point that Orr (1994: 113) makes when he says 'architecture is the prerogative of power and not that of those who teach and learn'.

These are operational aspects over which principals feel disempowered. However, there are examples where they do exercise some control. For example, small savings have been made through the use of low energy light bulbs, altering thermostats daily to account for outside temperatures, fitting of draft excluders on external doors, fitting of self-closing doors, putting timers on light switches and fitting spring-loaded shower taps.

Purchasing

Another aspect of centres' operations that the EMS would need to target would be the products which the centres purchase. All principals suggested they have only limited control over such purchases. This is because local authorities will use suppliers specifically to buy bulk. This therefore limits the extent to which centres may enquire into and influence their purchases in keeping with the principles of sustainable development. The issue of purchasing also raises particular prejudices. For example, Ladhar Bheinn raised the issue of products sold as 'environmentally friendly' being priced at a higher tariff. In particular Ladhar Beinn stated, as though it were self-evident, that 'you are not going to buy 'environmentally friendly' products that are three times the cost'. Whether or not this perception of higher pricing is accurate is a moot point because it is issues such as these which an EMS (whether external or in-

house) would clarify. This highlights the need for centres to go through the process to identify the facts relating to their own situation.

External Barriers

In these instances (purchasing and perception) principals felt prevented from and/or unwilling to act. However, there are other instances where attempts towards sustainable development are hindered by the existence of external barriers. One example of this was where Beinn Dearg bought jetty cleaner on the basis that it was sold as 'environmentally friendly'. The descaling of the jetty, it was felt by staff, did not conform to Health and Safety Executive standards and so they had to return to using some type of hypochloride. However, there are deep set value orientations at work here which begin to show the relationship between the scientific aspect of sustainability and the educational. The effect of hypochloride on the marine environment is a scientific issue. This should not be seen as limited to science because in order to fully understand the necessary educational response it is important to recognise that the 'problem' of the environment is one of perception (Orr, 1993). In this instance and also those related to purchasing, people hold values which influence their understanding of 'problems' related to the environment. The view that 'environmentally friendly' products are both more expensive and less efficient is a perception and not necessarily a fact. An EMS could identify the scientific facts to give guidance on the extent to which hypochloride affects the marine environment in comparison to the 'environmentally friendly' product. However, it must be remembered that perceptions of the world and ideas are at the source of an educational response to sustainable development (Evernden, 1985).

For the moment another example whereby external barriers hinder aspirations is where the community in which An Teallach resides decided that they did not want recycling bins. The nearest recycling point is about one hours drive away. Recyclable material would have to be transported there specially, which may well do more environmental harm than good. Yet another example is Lochnagar's attempts at habitat creation which angered a farmer because of grazing licences. What these examples show is the need for centres to be fully involved in local communities so as to take part in their decision making.

Tensions Between Departments

Findings show there are departmental tensions which need to be addressed in the transition to sustainable development. I will categorise these as either inter-departmental (relationships with departments external to the centre) and intra-department (departments within the centre).

• Inter-Departmental

During the period of my research I found that Beinn Dearg was in the early stages of planning an extension to their existing building. This particular case provides an insight to the sort of tensions which can arise. In addition to internal interests Beinn Dearg identified key external interests as: the education department, the architects' department, the building services department and a department responsible for policies about heating and energy conservation. Beinn Dearg stated 'there is at least five departments that are going to have an input into this and if I say I would like (to include principles of sustainable development) somebody will turn around and say it is not departmental policy or council policy. Lochnagar had similar experiences having just completed a building extension. Because the budget came from central funds, and not the centre's devolved budget (which is in any case only to cover operational costs), the principal had little say in its design. Lochnagar stated 'you lose control because they (building services) are seen as the experts and they have done it so many times before...there are sets of regulations that they're working to so in a sense they're holding a knowledge which you don't always have...somebody from the authority is coming out and managing the project but that's the constraints working for an education authority'. What this example shows is that where Councils do not include sustainable development as a policy initiative there is no mechanism by which they must acquiesce to its principles in the manner that Van der Ryn and Cowan's (1996) ecological design suggests.

• Intra-Department

Outdoor centres can be defined in relation to the different employment groupings which combine to operate them. In this sense there are instructors, caterers, office staff, housekeepers, gardeners and stores personnel. There is little evidence of existing tensions between departments arising as a consequence of sustainable development practices already in use. However, all principals believed tensions would arise if the centres were to implement an integrated policy of sustainable development. This would occur because of what (Smyth, 1998: 92) identifies as the tensions 'between the need for educational change and the stressful effects of change'. The issue therefore is not simply developing practices in keeping with sustainable development; it is about managing a process. One example highlighted this where principals reported that cleaners will sometimes infringe existing policy in order to be effective. An Teallach stated that 'we're not supposed to use bleach because of (the Council's) policy. We use freshguard and cleanguard which I am told do the job, but sometimes something stronger is needed'. In such cases an environmental policy would determine the facts relating to the effectiveness of bleach as opposed to freshguard. Consequently, convincing the cleaner to use the product is then a management issue (assuming the freshguard is effective).

One structural difficulty that may present a barrier is where the catering service is devolved to another company in the commercial sector. Carn an Fhìdhleir, Beinn Dearg and Lochnagar operate on the basis of devolved catering services. Any attempt at arriving at a policy would need to reconcile the competing demands of the commercial interest of the operating company and the educational interest of the centre. By phoning the parent authorities of all five centres I can confirm that each Council has a named Local Agenda 21 officer. This is the person with responsibility for implementing sustainable development throughout the Councils' operations and so assistance is available to centres should they choose to use it. In the case of catering, the centre is the customer and so it would be possible to include sustainable development issues in the contract whereby the Local Agenda 21 officer is available to co-ordinate and offer expert knowledge.

However, it must be remembered that the effectiveness of the Local Agenda 21 system is variable from one local authority to the next. A recent study found that of the five centres in this thesis two did not know if their Authority had a Local Agenda 21 officer Nicol (1999). Whilst this situation remains, centres will be excluded from the expertise relating to sustainable development and ultimately the role they can play. It is also the Scottish Office expectation that Local Agenda 21 'should not affect only Planning or Environmental Health Departments but be an integrated strategy for sustainable development which is understood and implemented by *all* departments (my emphasis)' (Scottish Office, 1999: 36).

Organisational Culture

Organisations are said to consist of peoples' 'needs, wishes, beliefs and identities' (Johnson and Scholes, 1989: 7). Handy (1985: 186) refers to the expression of these needs as organisational cultures made up of 'the feeling of a pervasive way of life, or set of norms'. Organisational cultures can take a visible form which, in an outdoor centre, can range from the posters on walls, to the way staff act towards pupils. These manifestations become a living expression of what is important to individual organisations. An example of this is Carn an Fhìdhleir's statement that 'every message given out by the centre...is quite clear to visitors, this is what we value, (it is in) the conversations we would have'.

However, organisations do not always operate on the basis of a single homogeneous culture. Given the different functions of an organisation it is usual to have differing cultures *within* organisations. One example of this is the difference described above between the catering service and the outdoor education programme. In such cases what is important is that the cultures are managed in such a way that the organisation's overall aims are being met. It is this point that Ladhar Bheinn made in suggesting that

the transition to sustainable development is not simply about sending staff on a training course. Ladhar Bheinn stated 'it is about changing attitudes and changing the culture of the centre and that takes months rather than days... it might take years' (reiterating Handy, 1985).

There was a recognition of this from the other four principals and this leads to the very heart of the greatest barrier preventing sustainable development becoming a part of the culture of outdoor education centres. The problem starts, as Beinn Dearg stated, from an understanding of 'the values (culture) at this moment in time'. The current culture arises out of the belief about what outdoor education is (and is not) which has been a theme throughout this thesis. As I have shown the staff of outdoor centres see their role as delivering predominantly personal and social development and outdoor activities.

Handy (1985: 187) suggests that cultures 'will require different kinds of people (who) have different ways of working' whereas An Teallach stated 'outdoor centres would not want to jump away from what is known and tested and valued'. There is a tension therefore between what is presently valued and the extent to which that culture will tolerate or welcome change. This is what Beinn Dearg meant in the statement that it is important to have 'the right people to do it'. Lochnagar anticipated resistance 'because it represents such a big level of change and rethinking'.

However, when pressed on how change could come about it seems that the issue is not whether it is possible to change but more, by what magnitude and by which time scale. For example Lochnagar stated that 'the first step would be to modify an existing programme'. In this way small changes can be made which begin to change the organisational culture. For example, the data point to some very innovative ideas for introducing ideas about human waste. Carn an Fhìdhleir highlighted the opportunities inherent in the residential aspect stating 'you can have messages for people as they sit on the loo, a fabled place for seminal reading. You have the opportunity to put a message across in an interesting and engaging way i.e. where does the toilet paper go?' Ideas from Ladhar Bheinn included looking at the distances instructors have to travel to activity sites in a minibus, is there a closer alternative? Can the ideas relating to sustainable transport be built into the activity? Lochnagar serves lunch as a buffet, instead of individually wrapped items, this could be used to introduce issues relating to packaging (use of resources and landfill issues). However, these discussions do not take place in a way that they could be described as part of the culture. Part of the organisational culture would be to begin those discussions and build them into the overall ethos that legitimates this area of work. As Carn an Fhìdhleir stated 'the message needs to be in their faces (pupils and staff) to say it is possible and you can

change. It is saying that you (pupils) can do something because we can do it here and on this scale, what can you do individually?' This is precisely the point Handy (1985: 188) makes in suggesting that 'the customs and traditions of a place are a powerful way of influencing behaviour'. In this sense the culture acts upon and is influenced by both inter- and intra- aspects of the organisation.

Good Practice

By beginning with this time scale and order of magnitude the seemingly insurmountable agenda that is sustainable development becomes achievable through elements of 'good' practice. To show how each centre is already contributing I will identify those elements and, importantly, how they contribute to the principles of sustainable development.

Beinn Dearg recycles aluminium cans in keeping with the principle that waste 'is a valuable material in the wrong place or whose owner has no immediate use for it' (Scottish Office, 1999: 22). In this way Beinn Dearg began to address waste minimisation strategies where the goal was to understand 'the relationship between resource use, process design and management, consumption patterns and waste generation' (Scottish Office, 1999: 22).

Lochnagar also recycles cans and have been limiting their waste through purchasing products with less packaging. They have also been actively involved in 'habitat creation'. As the Scottish Office (1999: 24) observes 'maintaining biodiversity...is a key indicator of sustainable development'. In creating a wildflower habitat Lochnagar is recognising that there is a role in maintaining and encouraging species diversity.

Carn an Fhìdhleir have set themselves targets to minimise the amount of waste to be collected for disposal by the Council. Although the practise is motivated by commercial impetus (they pay per container lifted) there is nevertheless reduced waste going to already overcrowded landfills, an issue highlighted by the Council for Environmental Education (1996) and Scottish CCC (1999). The same economic imperative has motivated Carn an Fhìdhleir to reduce the number of light bulbs used, to use low energy bulbs and fit spring loaded taps on showers. In terms of sustainable development 'the promotion of energy efficiency...will play a crucial role in combating climate change and...reducing Greenhouse gas emissions' (Scottish Office, 1999: 17-18).

An Teallach are actively engaged in an energy monitoring scheme and cutting down on organisational consumption by, for example, using the back of used paper for internal memos. Forest Enterprise has also given over some woodland where conservation

projects can take place. There is also a habitat creation development underway to develop lagoons on the foreshore to encourage wading birds. From the secondary sources quoted above An Teallach can be seen to be contributing, in some measure, to waste minimisation and maintaining biodiversity.

Ladhar Bheinn encourages the instructors to use activity sites close to the centre as opposed to those further away. Again, although the motivation is primarily economic, by reducing transport miles and ultimately vehicle emissions, gains can be made towards air quality (Scottish Office, 1999).

Visiting Teachers' Perceptions

I presented evidence in Chapters Five and Eight to show that outdoor centres set great store on the way that visiting school teachers valued their work. Because of this very apparent importance I decided to investigate the response principals' might expect from schools if they were to change their existing programme.

Beinn Dearg suggested it is personal and social development and the physical aspect that teachers want. Ladhar Bheinn agreed and in defence stated, 'it is our impression here that people are wanting us to do something that they cannot easily do back at school, they are paying quite a lot for it and they want us to do something that the teachers cannot do...Our clients, and I think of them as clients these days, are not asking for (sustainable development)'. In this situation Ladhar Bheinn is of the opinion that teachers want to arrive with their classes, hand them over to the instructors and as such 'they are not asking to link it in with school work, they are asking for general activities'. Similarly, An Teallach stated 'most schools at the moment go for personal and social development because it can be easily achieved and better than they can do at school. Teachers value that and come to us for it (there would be) difficulty selling this (programme) to schools and their staff. In support of this position An Teallach stated 'teachers come to (the centre) asking for what they had last year because the kids enjoyed it and they achieved what the teachers wanted them to achieve'. However, in terms of educational strategy one must ask 'where is the vision?'

Carn an Fhìdhleir stated 'in the schools there is a strong emphasis on personal and social development, the drive has been in supporting kids through the curriculum and this has been valued more'. This is the reason that An Teallach stated 'outdoor centres would not want to jump away from what is known and tested and valued, schools would rather things the way they are'. However, Carn an Fhìdhleir also stated 'there would be a demand for this programme but there may be uncertainty as to what the school teachers think that they would be buying into'. It is instructive to note that the

two centres who have run *Earthkeepers* courses in the past are both concerned that the difficulty they have in persuading schools to select *Earthkeepers* would be the same if a programme of sustainable development were introduced.

Despite the strong anecdotal evidence to suggest that schools would not be interested in this programme, principals remained enthusiastic about a modified version. For example, An Teallach stated 'we can increase the variety of what we do and ask 'would you like this? and try and sell it that way'. Similarly Ladhar Bheinn stated 'there is a group in this week whose main agenda is to have lots of activities so we could not sacrifice that but the way we present that can be more sympathetic to sustainable development if that was a contracted sub-agenda, sub-text to the main text'.

Pupils' Perceptions

There is also concern that pupils would react against the introduction of this programme. Lochnagar was concerned that the programme would not be 'a sufficient attraction for the children to make them want to come...it wouldn't appear as exciting as an adventure programme'. An Teallach was concerned that the pupils would find the programme too 'placid...that it sounds more like a classroom lesson (with too much) teacher input (and) too theoretical'. This was a curious statement since the programme need be no more 'placid', 'class-based', 'theoretical' nor have any more 'teacher input' than the existing *Earthkeepers* courses which they run. Similarly, Ladhar Bheinn stated 'there is a public perception in the minds of the kids, of what an outdoor centre means and the parents are paying and they say you will be abseiling and canoeing, that is what they expect and if they don't get that they feel cheated'. It is relevant to note that the programme did not say that these activities would not be included and this statement represents an unexamined assumption on the part of Ladhar Bheinn. As is explained in the 'principles of learning' there is a great deal of freedom in how the programme could be carried out. If Ladhar Bheinn did run this programme and it did prove to be unpopular this might equally be because the programme was poorly constructed or simply unpopular because of poor marketing, poor teaching, or a lack of imagination.

An important aspect of the last two sections (visiting teachers' perceptions and pupils' perceptions) is that they deal with the principals' perceptions of other peoples' perceptions. The principals have been used as one source of data to identify potential barriers that may exist before any such programme could be implemented. The validity of these claims therefore does not lie in whether they accurately represent the views of teachers and pupils. This therefore identifies a pathway for future research. No current research exists which identifies the relationship between the expectations of pupils and teachers on the one hand and what centres deliver on the other. The

research would seek to establish the extent to which pupils and teachers view outdoor activities and personal and social development as the legitimate role of centres and the extent to which that belief represents an opportunity, or obstacle, to implementing a programme of sustainable development. The result could then be compared with the findings of what the principals believe these perceptions to be.

Power and Politics

It is apparent from principals' responses that if they are to become engaged in delivering this programme they do not want to begin on their own. Beinn Dearg stated 'if it is the way we should be going let's have a departmental initiative, a national initiative, to ensure that the objectives are able to be met...the initiative should come from above'. Despite me presenting a 'mandate for outdoor education for sustainable development' which demonstrates that such initiative exists there remains a sense of disempowerment. It would appear that Local Agenda 21 officers are not communicating with outdoor centres. There is a gap between the national rhetoric of sustainable development and its implementation at a local level. This is why Beinn Dearg feels restricted, a point made clear in the statement that 'I am just the employee of the authority and it is my remit to carry out the aims and objectives of the Council'. If the Council's responsibilities on sustainable development were more widely known, this principal would realise that there is a policy infrastructure to deliver sustainable development objectives.

However, this indicates a conflict of interests. Beinn Dearg stated 'we have a Council behind us 110%. It doesn't see our benefits at the moment in terms of sustainable education'. Taking cognisance of the political climate Lochnagar stated 'this place was almost closed so there is also the politics of asking for things. If you shout too loud you draw attention to yourself. I play a political game in keeping the centre open'. The problem appears to be that despite having a policy for sustainable development there is no specific mention for the role of outdoor education. Ladhur Beinn suggested if the profile of outdoor education was raised then centres 'would have a big contribution to make, (but first) government and education authorities should take a stand on these things'.

Summary

The guiding question throughout this chapter has been 'how can outdoor education centres respond to sustainable development?' Because of the definitional difficulties relating to the terms 'sustainable development', 'sustainability' and 'education for sustainability', I decided the best way to achieve this was to present a programme I had developed which claimed to deliver sustainable development outcomes. The purpose was threefold; first, identify present provision; second, identify opportunities for

change; and third, identify barriers which might prevent such change. The change in mind was from the anthropocentric practice already identified in Chapter Seven to something more ecocentric as espoused by deep ecology (Naess, 1989; Sessions, 1995). I am not therefore arguing that the programme I presented has any inherent validity (i.e. that it will deliver the claimed outcomes). The reason I devised and used the programme in this way was to go beyond those definitional issues, identified by Smyth, *et al.*, (1997), which can prevent discussion of *who* is to take responsibility in delivering the objectives relating to sustainable development.

In using this research approach I was making explicit the view that education can be about establishing priorities including aims, assumptions, content and methods. These were labelled 'principles of sustainable development', 'ethical principles', 'principles of learning' and a 'timetable of activities' complete with 'learning outcomes'. These combine to give what I termed 'a mandate for outdoor education', designed to demonstrate that, at a philosophical level, outdoor education could deliver outcomes specific to sustainable development. The purpose of the interview was to look at means of implementation. The 'mandate for outdoor education' was designed specifically with Reason's (1998) four point epistemology in mind which recognises four discrete areas of knowledge (experiential, presentational, propositional and practical) to cater for the educational needs of the whole child (Donaldson, 1978).

In terms of knowledge of sustainable development, the first finding concurs with a range of secondary sources (Smyth, Blackmore and Harvey, 1997; the Sustainable Development Education Panel, 1998; and the Secretary of State for Scotland's Advisory Group on Education for Sustainable Development, 1999) that there is some difficulty in accepting that social, economic and political issues are as legitimate an area of education as the 'green' environment. This is hardly surprising given that it is merely a reflection of wider society coming to terms with the same difficulties (Barr, 1998). What this finding does highlight however is the lack of theoretical support readily available to principals on which to design this type of programme. In this absence principals are left unsure of the relationship between education and sustainable development. Therefore there is no acknowledgement whether education is for transforming society in the manner that Naess (1989), Orr (1993) and O' Sullivan (1999) suggest, or as a means of maintaining the status quo, which is the present implied, but unacknowledged position at centres.

This leads to the findings related to the appropriateness of outdoor education in delivering this programme. As a signatory to *Agenda 21* (UNCED, 1992) the United Kingdom and all sectors of society are supposed to be looking towards implementing sustainable development principles. However, some centres resist this obligation

suggesting that outdoor education has no greater responsibility than anyone else. Whilst this point is debatable it, more importantly, represents a barrier to implementation. Consequently a distinction must be made between centres which reject the programme in principle and those who accept the principles but are concerned about implementation. This distinction is not as apparent as it first seems. Those who rejected in principle did so because of the scale of change the programme suggested. However, what united all centres were the possibilities presented by small changes. When these possibilities are not seen as threats then it becomes apparent that although in general centres are not consciously delivering on sustainable development they do deliver parts. In this respect there was a suggestion that programmes could be either introduced incrementally or trialled on weekends.

Camping is seen to represent a major obstacle due to the staffing cost. However evidence exists that this can be overcome through creative timetabling. Also, although the cost of running such programmes will be more than multi-activity programmes, I have demonstrated how one principal (An Teallach) has been able to attract inward funding from two different sources, specifically for sustainable development. This is in keeping with Baczala's (1992: 12) comment that 'even though there are elements of the (centre) environment that cannot be improved because of other priorities for funding, a great deal can be achieved by demonstrating that efforts have at least been made'.

A greater obstacle than cost, although it has cost implications, is the staff training that all principals consider necessary. There is currently no formal nor integrated training available in this educational aspect. However, this could be achieved through the identification of key individuals external to the centre providing expert knowledge on issues of sustainable development. For example the *Secretary of State for Scotland's Advisory Group on Education for Sustainable Development* (1999) advised the Scottish Executive that education should be included in the development of Local Agenda 21. Clearly, as far as outdoor education centres are concerned, this has not happened as centres and their Local Agenda 21 officers have not met. A meeting of 'experts' on sustainable development and 'experts' of outdoor education would appear to be a step forward in making such changes. It would also be in keeping with the holistic education, drawing on different forms of knowledge espoused by Orr (1993), Marshall (1995), Reid (1995), Smyth (1995), Heron (1996) and Reason (1998).

If such external expertise were to be brought in, evidence from interviews suggests that principals would be keen to prevent a feeling of disempowerment amongst staff. In this sense they are keen to maintain ownership of staff training. Thus, it would be acceptable to bring in experts for their technical knowledge but the process of change, being more sensitive, would need to be managed in-house. The challenge of in-house

training would therefore be to overcome staff disinterest and the feeling that staff training is solely about developing personal competence in national governing body awards. It is possible that some means of certification would be necessary in order to validate this process.

Part of this process of change would mean identifying a suitable EMS. This would identify ways in which the operations of each centre could minimise their environmental impact. If centres were to attract funding they could continually improve their environmental performance and pay for an external EMS such as EMAS. In the likely event of funding being unavailable centres could do their own. Whether the EMS was to be in-house or external, pedagogical teaching aspects would need to be included. This is in keeping with holistic approaches where education is to be found not just in the activity itself but embedded within the conceptual orientations of centres' operations. The EMS would take cognisance of each centre's entire operations including all the departments within the centre and those external departments with which the centre has to liaise.

From the evidence presented an EMS would have to identify means of improvement in areas such as reducing energy in what are acknowledged as energy inefficient buildings, monitoring of products purchased (centrally and locally) and whether the alternatives to cleaning products conform to Health and Safety Guidelines. It would also need to take cognisance of existing systems within the local community which might affect systems implementation (e.g. recycling bins, creating habitats on private land).

The EMS would build on existing elements of good practice which have been identified as waste minimisation strategies, energy efficiency, biodiversity (habitat creation) and vehicle emissions. Although I can put these forward as elements of good practice they are not pedagogic tools as the instructors have not incorporated these issues into the activity programme. Finding creative ways of doing this is central to moving towards holistic programming. One such example is Orr's (1994) architecture as pedagogy. From a research perspective work needs to be done to understand and evaluate phenomenological aspects of pupils' experiences whilst at outdoor centres. This might begin to indicate the relationship between outdoor activities, the nature of experience they engender and the sorts of teaching approaches and relationships between instructors and pupils conducive to environmental education outcomes.

Principals believed that teachers value existing programmes to the extent that this programme would be resisted. The perception that this barrier exists was a strong feature of all principals' testimony. This is not wholly valid for two reasons. The first

is that the evidence remains anecdotal from their conversations with visiting teachers. These teachers are a self-selecting sample as it is normal procedure for them to volunteer to accompany pupils. If a representative sample of teachers were to be undertaken this would need to include school teachers who do not visit centres. The second is that this anecdotal evidence is support for what is already done as opposed to not supporting the introduction of this new programme (there is no evidence that principals discuss issues of education for sustainability with visiting staff). These are two very different positions and this barrier will remain until empirical research establishes the validity, or otherwise, of this claim. However, it is recognised that principals feel unable to develop such an approach on their own. They argue that their present survival is due to a combination of local council, pupil, teacher and parent support for what they already do. This acts as a powerful motivation *against* change.

EDUCATION OFFICERS

Chapter Ten highlighted the concerns of principals in relation to introducing a sustainable development programme. These can be summarised into two points, the first being the belief that existing programmes are valued by pupils, visiting teachers, and departmental superiors to the extent that programmes are meeting current needs. The second is deduced from the first and asks 'if present provision is of such value why change it?' I have presented evidence which suggests that these two positions are very insular and born out of survivalist strategies designed to offset threats of centre closures and in defence of the status quo. I wanted to explore this insularity by reviewing these conclusions alongside the views and policy objectives of each parent authority. In so doing I wanted to evaluate the degree of accuracy of the first point and identify the opportunities for introducing new programmes such as my own proposal. The link between the previous chapter and this is that Chapter Ten represents the potential for programme diversity, whereas this chapter is about exploring the strategic overview in which such programmes might be considered. It is important to identify those people who have the responsibility for the vision and policy direction of outdoor education centres to identify whether this vision includes supporting education relating to sustainable development. To do this I interviewed each centre principal's departmental superior. The interviews lasted approximately 30 minutes. They were tape-recorded and transcribed. The transcripts were used to develop the following codes:

- Support for the status quo
- Security
- Support from councillors
- Measurement
- Policy links between centres, schools and department
- Change.

This coding system is used in the text below as headings so that each code item is analysed individually. As a point of procedure I will adopt the same convention as Chapter Ten and refer to each education officer by the pseudonym of the centre they represent.

The first point to note is the position and relative standing of each interviewee in their departmental structure. My intention was to identify the person with direct responsibility for outdoor education. In declining order of seniority these are:

An Teallach who is a service manager (equivalent to a deputy director)

Beinn Dearg is acting deputy of education with responsibilities for non-statutory education including outdoor education

Carn an Fhithleir is called a 'quality development officer' who answers directly to the director on issues of outdoor education

Lochnagar is termed an 'adviser' a position two levels below that of deputy director

Ladhar Bheinn is called a 'principal officer' which is also a position two levels below deputy director.

In summary all of the interviewees represent senior positions in the departmental hierarchy.

Support for the Status Quo

Responses from all local authority officers confirm (in keeping with evidence from instructors, principals and school teachers presented in Chapters Five, Six, Seven, Eight, Nine and Ten) that they believe the most important aspect of outdoor education at their respective centres to be outcomes relating to personal and social development.

Carn an Fhithleir stated 'it gives teachers a picture of pupils they would not otherwise have and that is vitally important'. Beinn Dearg stated it is about 'the adventure experience, but mostly confidence, self esteem, adaptability, motivation, being able to come back from that and being able to do things that they otherwise perhaps wouldn't be able to do, like being able to settle better in other (school) situations'. An Teallach stated overtly 'it is primarily to do with what you could call personal and social development'. Similarly, Ladhar Bheinn stated 'it makes a major contribution to the personal development of pupils'. Lochnagar linked the perceived outcomes to school suggesting outdoor education represents an alternative to team sports, it develops their confidence and brings out aspects of their personality not necessarily seen at school.

In keeping with the findings of previous chapters there is good reason to question the extent and range of these outcomes and whether they are actually being achieved in one week courses. However, the purpose of resurrecting the issue is not to test the validity of the claims but to evaluate the strength of belief that surrounds them. It would appear that the belief that these outcomes are being achieved remains unchallenged for a variety of reasons. In An Teallach's case 'the centre is booked up 18 months in advance so repeat visits by schools indicate that demand is very strong, (schools) value what they get...outdoor education is a scarce resource in (this Council area)'. Lochnagar, Beinn Dearg, Carn an Fhithleir and Lochnagar all report similar oversubscription. What this suggests is that personal and social development

outcomes are not the measures of success so much as repeat bookings. This is consistent with findings in Chapter Seven. It is also an indication that there is contentment with existing centre provision. This point was made quite clearly by An Teallach (and is indicative of the other four officers) who stated that ‘(the principal) is getting customer satisfaction’. This finding is consistent with previous chapters where instructors, principals and now local authority officers use repeat bookings to indicate customer satisfaction and hold customer satisfaction as *the* measure of educational achievement.

In another supportive context Carn an Fhìdhleir stated ‘the week away tells you more about the child than you can ever learn in school’. Similarly, Lochnagar believed the residential experience to be an opportunity to be away from home and responsible for themselves. Beinn Dearg saw existing outdoor education programmes as a positive step in delivering within the UK government’s social inclusion policy initiative. Lastly, Ladhar Bheinn believed that existing programmes contribute to the well-being of pupils. This confirms that all five local authority officers show satisfaction with existing programmes.

Security

There is a close correspondence between this satisfaction and the feeling that the future existence of centres is secure. Bearing in mind that research shows there are only nine remaining local authority outdoor education centres in Scotland in contrast to fifteen in 1996 (Nicol, 1998), the situation appears now to have stabilised.

This feeling of security becomes apparent in a variety of forms. An Teallach demonstrated the influence of local community support stating ‘when it (the centre) was to be closed there was a tremendous ground swell from parents and schools to keep it open’. Carn an Fhìdhleir drew on a similar form of support stating, ‘it is our experience that the outdoor experience is still what parents, teachers and pupils want’. Looking to the future, and in referring to centre closures, Beinn Dearg stated ‘I think that we have hit the bottom of the trough, and the growth of the social inclusion agenda should mean that in this Council we will not get further cuts...I think that there will continue to be a place (for outdoor education)’. Ladhar Bheinn stated ‘our director is very supportive and sees the value of these centres and at the moment there is no threat to them’. Lochnagar believed that the way in which ‘the centre has developed its own charging policy has...helped to make it secure’.

Support from Councillors

The support for centres extends to elected councillors. Every 18 months or so An Teallach provides an outing for their key members. Talking of the threat of closure

Carn an Fhithleir stated 'councillors were particularly keen to keep them because it was something that they had'. Referring to a proposed building extension Beinn Dearg stated 'we are hoping to make improvements...partly because of the strong support of elected members'. In Ladhar Bheinn's case there was a belief that the very existence of centres makes it unappealing to elected members to close them.

Organisational security in this sense is limited to the extent that members would have the political will to remove funding from a valued resource. Perhaps the most telling statement in this respect comes from Carn an Fhithleir who stated that the future of their centre was 'not simply an educational decision, it was political'. This is further evidence to suggest that the existence of centres depends less on their ability to deliver educational outcomes than the personal beliefs of key individuals. It also adds credibility to the view that instructors, principals, schools, local authority officers and now elected members, support the maintenance of the status quo.

Measurement

Geographically these decision makers are very distant from the point of delivery which raises the question 'what are the criteria on which decisions relating to outdoor education are made?' Given that the support of the status quo seemed paramount I sought to discover any other performance indicators that local authority officers used.

Carn an Fhithleir stated 'you cannot quantifiably measure the outdoor experiences in the same way as you can examination passes, but you can in terms of customer satisfaction, asking the teachers and children what they have gained from the experience'. I asked to be referred to this evidence and was told 'outdoor education (the centres) have to answer that question'. Given the absence of evidence I can conclude that no work has been done in this area. I asked Ladhar Bheinn the measures they used and the reply was 'we have not looked at it for outdoor education'. Beinn Dearg stated 'it would be helpful to outdoor education if measurement...took place but I am not sure what the measurement would be. We haven't really addressed the more qualitative aspects'. The most telling testimony came from An Teallach who, referring to measurement, stated 'lip service gets paid to it, the reality is that it is all about resources'. This appears to strike at the very heart of local authority outdoor education provision. It is not about the nature of educational outcomes so much as the fact that either, people in key positions have had formative experiences which lead them to support it, or, resources are in sufficient supply that it is more politically opportune to maintain the service rather than withdraw it. Consequently, in times of financial well-being this enthusiasm fuels the commitment to resource it. Meantime centres provide a staple programme which pupils and visiting teachers have become used to. Since the measurement of success appears to be return visits there exists a sense of stability and

immutability about the centres' products.

Although this would be the majority view Lochnagar provided some evidence of diversification. In this case there is a clear tendency towards linking the outdoor education week with pupils' school curriculum. This is evident in the officer's view that 'outdoor education (should) be linked to the school creating continuity and progression (of the educational experience)'. Coherent attempts at integration with the school curriculum are largely absent elsewhere. Here, however, these beliefs are born out of personal experience where the officer's views are based on school teaching experience. This enthusiasm for curricular links with the school has begun with the setting up of a management group looking at the centre's role in relation to schools (the group includes school representatives). There is no other similar model throughout any of the other research sites. Because the end goal (curricular links) is established the task of measurement becomes easier. As the officer suggested, the most difficult point to get over is the difference between teaching objectives and learning outcomes. This, I suggest, is the defining aspect of outdoor education at the other four centres. There has been a dependency on stating learning outcomes such as interpersonal relationships, self-esteem and self-awareness. However, these are not learning outcomes they are teaching objectives. These are the goals which instructors want to achieve but without any systematic knowledge that they actually become learning outcomes. As Beinn Dearg stated outdoor education 'does tend to be a grand philosophical gesture rather than hard quantification'. Thus, before any measurement can begin this point needs to be addressed.

Policy Links Between Centres, Schools and Department

If programmes are to become more diverse then it seems that the tripartite relationship between the local authorities, schools and centres has to be better understood and managed. At this point I wanted to establish the power differential between the three to establish from where change might come. The first point to note is that none of the local authorities have a formal policy for outdoor education. This makes it very difficult to identify areas of responsibility between the school, centre and local authority. However An Teallach's view was that 'it is not (his) job to advise (the centre) on policy. They are professional and aware of the national agendas and are able to do that'. Similarly, Carn an Fhithleir, whilst adopting an overall responsibility for policy, nevertheless liked to remain at arms length. In a similar manner Beinn Dearg stated 'there is no exhortation from the authority that schools must undertake outdoor education'. Carn an Fhithleir stated 'it is for centres to see how they can package themselves to make sure people understand what they could contribute to these initiatives'. Lochnagar, as discussed above, took a more inclusive approach with the setting up of a management committee. However, it would appear that generally (four

cases out of five) the relationship between the centre and local authority is characterised by a lack of local authority intervention.

This lack of intervention between local authority departments and centres is better characterised by a large degree of autonomy as far as the relationship between the authority and the school is concerned. Carn an Fhithleir pointed to the fact that they devolve decisions to schools stating 'over 90% of the budget is delegated to schools and they make their decisions'. Ladhair Bheinn pointed to devolved school management stating 'it is up to individual schools to choose what centre they go to'. (This is subject to initial approval from the authority where approval is restricted to issues of safety and centre quality, such as the fabric of the building, but not educational quality). Beinn Dearg stated 'the authority does work very much on the basis of delegated funding and if schools want to spend their money in this way (on outdoor education as opposed to any other school trip)...schools can work out their own deals on this'.

Change

It is important to remember that the subsidy offered to schools to support outdoor education places it in a favourable position. For example a school trip to an outdoor centre will be subsidised by the local authority whereas other school trips have to be funded from alternative sources. It is this subsidy, particularly for pupils deemed financially disadvantaged (through the free school meals and clothing grant means-test) that makes the week at an outdoor centre more financially attractive than an unsubsidised school trip elsewhere. For example, one authority (Carn An Fhithleir) contributed a £22,000 subsidy for the financial year 1999.

Given this level of financial commitment, together with the unmitigated support for existing programmes and taking the freedom from intervention that centres enjoy (from local authorities); add to this the autonomy that schools enjoy in determining their own expenditure, and the challenge becomes to determine how these different forces may come to bear on centres developing a programme linking outdoor education and sustainable development.

An Teallach is responsive to such a development which is not surprising since this is the only centre that is running regular *Earthkeepers* courses. I pointed out that the EMS (Environmental Management System) at their centre stopped short of implementing major changes in terms of energy efficiency and that to carry forward those changes would mean significant expenditure. In response An Teallach stated 'EMAS (Eco-Management and Audit Scheme) is about improvement, not turning it round overnight', which is an accurate assessment. However, I made the point that

even small changes would require financial resources. An Teallach replied 'if (the principal) can demonstrate that over a ten year period we can save this much then there is the potential to argue the case'. Here then is an example of a very senior officer who appears willing to present to Council a plan of investment on the basis of sustainable development. Some work would need to be done by the principal to convert the findings of EMAS into costings. Given the level of support that this centre enjoys from its elected members this represents a unique opportunity to implement the principles of sustainable development in an outdoor centre (since none of the other four centres have undergone an EMS).

Whilst not talking specifically about sustainable development Carn an Fhithleir stated 'we have had discussions with enterprise companies, they have a key role in terms of having a vision where the centres are part of the economic structure of an area,...the whole concept of community planning is something that needs to be taken on-board here'. The integration of the centre with the community in which it operates is a central feature of sustainable development and Carn an Fhithleir is pointing to how an entrepreneurial approach can identify sources of funding and support not yet fully acknowledged by outdoor educators. More specifically Carn an Fhithleir stated that 'the leader of the Council is keen on sustainable development (and) it is for centres to see how they can package themselves to make sure people understand what they could contribute to these initiatives...but they have to be *more pro-active*'.

The present financial arrangements will not allow, as Lochnagar commented, a means by which centres can access the necessary funds. This suggests that the cost of implementation will always be restrictive. In the officer's own words 'it is very unlikely that any authority would be looking at sustainable development in terms of the buildings'.

When I asked Ladhar Bheinn if sustainable development was a policy initiative they are currently implementing, the officer was not aware of any policy initiative nor the meaning of the term. I did not pursue this as I had already established that Ladhar Bheinn's current state of knowledge would prevent any pro-active development on the part of the officer.

Similarly, Beinn Dearg was non-committal explaining that he 'is not up on the thinking in this area'. Given further explanation Beinn Dearg responded 'you could pursue it through...the environment, and its potential for economic development would be to equip them with skills and attitudes that would benefit them individually and societally'. This therefore is a statement of support if only in principle. However, it is an important statement because Beinn Dearg didn't say that it is *not* the role of centres

to deliver such programmes. In terms of finding money to conduct an EMS Beinn Dearg wanted to know in what way this is different from a normal maintenance review. When I suggested that by the end of the EMS process there would be steps identified to reduce environmental impact Beinn Dearg replied 'quite a lot of that has been done'. I did not have access to the maintenance review and so cannot comment on its contents although in terms of sustainable development the fact that some information is already available is something that could be built on. However, this must be evaluated against the likelihood of achieving funds to implement the maintenance review proposals. In this respect Beinn Dearg stated 'the capital programmes are so often raided because of dire emergency'.

Summary

Given the range and depth of support for current multi-activity programmes the task within this chapter was to determine the opportunities which local authority officers saw in developing a programme related to sustainable development. Findings confirm that personal and social development is the primary instrumental objective of outdoor education.

Centres have become resourceful in coping with threats of closure by increasing their cost recovery (a point established in Chapter Eight) and through diplomacy (inviting elected members to view operations). This support has determined that outdoor education has become valued in a political sense rather than an educational one. In addition to this there is a lack of clarity between teaching objectives and learning outcomes where their synonymous use has led to an uncritical acceptance that what is being said to happen is the same as what is actually happening. Relevant measurement of learning outcomes and programme evaluation cannot readily be achieved by internal evaluation until this distinction is made. The current support that centres enjoy (from pupils, visiting teachers, parents, local authorities and elected members) acts as an agent of exclusiveness preventing any analysis of this type emerging. There is no stimulus to make it happen.

It is clear from all local authority officers that if centres want to diversify, the impetus must come from the centres themselves or individual schools. Carn an Fhithleir stated 'it is the centre's responsibility to find out about these policies and market themselves accordingly with authority assistance'. To respond to Government policy initiatives, centres would have to become more proactive perhaps in the manner of the model being developed by Lochnagar. In terms of government policy on sustainable development and provided there was willingness to address this issue, a start could be made by setting up management committees consisting of representatives from centres and schools and involve the councils' Agenda 21 and education officers). The function of

the groups would be to develop councils' policies on sustainable development with specific emphasis on how outdoor education can contribute. Such groups could begin to bring pressure to bear on the Scottish Executive to make a policy statement on outdoor education generally and sustainable development specifically. Throughout this awareness raising stage the different post holders within the management committee could begin to identify and implement the model of a whole-centre approach to sustainable development. In this way the building as a pedagogic strategy, the organisational culture and the learning outcomes, could combine to provide an integrated five-day programme linking outdoor education and sustainable development.

CONCLUSIONS

We the world's people, want to survive; but more than that, we want a satisfactory life for all of us and for our descendants. To achieve that goal we need a new kind of development, and we must learn to live differently (IUCN *et al.*, 1991: 4).

This statement neatly summarises the three concerns of this thesis, namely, people, the environment and learning. The principle assumption underpinning the investigation is that given the present levels of consumption and distribution of natural resources the world's population is living unsustainably. This raises fundamental questions as to the nature and purpose of education. To this end I have posed the primary research question 'what can outdoor education do for sustainable living?'

The theoretical position adopted to understand the relationship between people and their environment is that of deep ecology. The principle tenet of deep ecology is the ontological assumption that 'humanity is inseparable from nature' (Naess, 1989: 2). As a philosophy it posits solutions which require changes in the way human beings think of humanity and its relationship with the natural environment which are in keeping with the IUCN (1991) statement above. Deep ecology deals with two of the three concerns of this thesis since its focus is the relationship between people and the environment which, in philosophical terms, is described as the union of the psychological and the ontological (Naess, 1989). However, despite its philosophical grounding deep ecology, as a theoretical standpoint, does not have much to say about learning in terms of epistemology and pedagogy.

To address this gap I have introduced Reason's (1998) four point epistemological framework which comprises experiential, presentational, propositional and practical ways of knowing the world. By bridging this gap I have demonstrated a direct link between Naess's (1989) ecological ontology, an epistemological framework in which that reality may be understood and the pedagogic context in which learning might take place (outdoor education).

However, outdoor education has not developed as a pedagogic endeavour with this or any other philosophical framework in mind. At first sight secondary sources seem to suggest otherwise with their abundant claims that outdoor education consists of three aspects, namely the activity, personal and social development and environmental education (Hopkins and Putnam, 1993; Barrett and Greenaway, 1995; Higgins and Loynes, 1997). However, content analysis of the UK literature shows that there is an

imbalance between the three which favours the activity and personal and social development at the expense of environmental education. This finding was born out empirically with confirmatory data from the pilot study (Chapter Five). This finding was a turning point in the thesis. Until then I had expected to identify elements of good environmental education practice (where good practice would be identified from a deep ecology standpoint) and develop a case-study approach as a means of developing an outcome-based research strategy. The finding of imbalance suggested something deeper and prejudicial from the instructors was working against the ontological assumptions of sustainable living. The purpose of the thesis then became a process of making explicit unexamined assumptions about how instructors conceptualised their work. Whereas before the research focus was leading towards learning outcomes (pupils), now it became centred on teaching objectives (instructors). To guide this aspect a *secondary* research question became 'what is the nature of outdoor education as perceived by the instructors employed within local authority outdoor centres?'

My findings suggest that activities are used in two ways. The first is where instructors believe that pupils should experience activities for their own sake (as a recreational pursuit). Practical activities on their own do not fit in with Reason's (1998) epistemological framework and so this line of inquiry came to an end. However, in passing I would like to note an area of further study. The research that needs to take place is whether the pursuit of recreational activities represent a 'legitimate' form of education. My tentative explorations suggest that further research would concentrate on philosophical aspects asking in what sense do outdoor activities constitute something educational (Carr, 1978)? This would need to include an appraisal of the socio-cultural context in which education is valued (Beedie, 1996).

However, I was interested more in the instrumental aims associated with activities. It became clear that when instructors talked of aims they attached different levels of weighting to each claim. I developed the framework of 'substantive', 'intended' and 'consequential' which allowed me to differentiate between levels of claims. Findings from the pilot study show that personal and social development features mostly as substantive and intended aims because they have a high priority with instructors. Consequential aims on the other hand have less obvious importance and are perceived to happen through a process of 'osmosis'. Environmental education features as the latter. These findings from the pilot study were consistent throughout all sites with notable exceptions described below.

What became evident in the pilot study was the power of the rhetoric instructors used when talking of personal and social development. This was not reproduced when talking of environmental education. This made little sense in relation to Cooper's

(1991) claim that personal and social development and environmental education are one and the same thing. What I set out to do was to review Cooper's claim in light of my emergent category of claims and so I posed the question 'in what sense is personal and social development environmental education?'

I identified three elements of personal and social development which correspond with the 5-14 guidelines (SOED, 1993c). These are interpersonal relationships, self-esteem and self-awareness.

Interpersonal Relationships

By focussing on interpersonal relationships I found that there is no formal qualification in personal and social development available for outdoor education instructors. Nor are teaching experience and educational qualifications necessarily a condition of employment at centres. This lack of an integrated approach to training undermines the claims made by instructors in relation to personal and social development. The evidence shows that long-serving instructors act as trainers for new staff. Because the trainers themselves are not subject to external validation, or any form of on-going training, any training that does occur is a codified form of practice embedded in, and particular to, each organisation. Consequently, instructors are isolated from philosophical, methodological and practitioner developments outside of their own centres. The development of practice without theory has allowed the rhetoric relating to interpersonal relationships to develop in an uncritical way. In this manner teamwork becomes a reproduction of an everyday activity, less concerned with interpersonal processes and pupil-centredness and characterised more by a didactic relationship between instructor and pupil.

This points to another important finding which depends on the understanding of the difference between processes and products. Teamwork is an example of the latter where the belief exists that a team could be built and that by the end of a week the pupils would exist either as a team or as a group of individual team players ready to fit into other social settings. This features strongly in aspects of practice. However, a strong distinction can be made between this aspect and that of process-centredness. The findings show situations of the latter, which can be characterised by a move from normative to exploratory pupil/instructor relationships, where the instructor and not the activity is the mediating force and where the relationship between instructors and pupils is in itself a valued outcome.

The difference between the two approaches indicates a degree of dissonance between aims and activities. It is compelling evidence that a range of contradictory views exist as to what it is that the activities are designed to achieve. Consequently, what

instructors are not prepared to do, in a universal sense, is to review their practice in relation to what they set out to achieve.

Self-Esteem

Given this lack of an objectively valid pedagogic conception I developed a framework of aims, assumptions, content, method and claims to assist analysis. In analysing self-esteem against these criteria I found it to be the most frequently quoted aim at these research sites where two themes emerged. Activities generally fall into one of two categories where they are either short duration, high-excitement and instructor intensive (i.e. where the instructor/pupil relationship is didactic); alternatively, activities occur over a longer period where considerable physical effort is required and a more interactive instructor/pupil relationship is possible. In the case of the former, self-esteem is assumed to be raised through the overcoming of emotional challenges and in the latter by overcoming physical challenges. I have challenged the accuracy of both these claims because there is no attempt to either monitor or evaluate outcomes. This is an area requiring urgent research attention to establish the extent to which the pursuit of activities does raise self-esteem. The research would need to address my finding that in some cases, particularly in the high excitement activities, there are instances where it appears that when instructors talk of self-esteem they refer to their own ability to encourage, or coerce, as opposed to the pupils' innermost feelings of self-esteem. This raises the question of 'who determines success?' an issue that future research will need to consider.

However, my interest in this area was tangential. I was using self-esteem to understand how the current practices within outdoor education might correspond to deep ecology. What these findings demonstrate is that some activities are more suited than others. Those of the high-excitement, instructor-centredness variety do not correspond well with Reason's (1998) epistemology. They may develop experiential knowledge and there may be occasions where that experience is presented in the form of a logbook (encouraging presentational knowledge). However, there is no attempt to establish what that experience means nor how it has practical implications. More importantly there is little attempt to use that experience as a basis for new experiences as Dewey (1963) suggests. The slower activities occurring over a longer period which are more pupil-centred have potential to follow Dewey's model of linking experiences. This is because they are not inherently dependent on technical input from the instructor. Instead there are opportunities where a conscious effort on the part of the instructor can be made to create situations and experiences designed to achieve outcomes not deemed inherent in the activity. This finding represents an opportunity to develop deep ecology at residential outdoor centres.

Self-Awareness

This opportunity is better understood in relation to self-awareness which is an extension of self-esteem. It is an extension because it looks at the pupil's inner representations (self-esteem) in relation to their perceptions of the outer (SOED, 1993c). In this way pupils can become aware of the world around them, with the instructor having a direct role in terms of mediation. The instructor also has the opportunity to consciously choose the activities and methods most suited to the chosen aim. In this sense the activities are not the 'osmotic' mediators of experiences and there may be a more deliberate role for the instructor who can consciously choose the activities and methods most suited to the chosen aim. The transition for the instructor is from the role of technician to educator.

Self-awareness also has a values and action component. Consequently, ideas relating the pupil to their place in society becomes a legitimate educational focus. At this point the potential outcomes relating to self-awareness and deep ecology converge to become one and the same thing. Although I argue this point theoretically there were two examples which touched on these issues. One important finding from these is that they took place during hillwalking and both involved a discussion of some sort. This type of activity is distinguishable from other activities which are either excitement led or technique dependent. In the case of the former, discussion relies more on the conscious efforts of instructors to create opportunities, as opposed to the latter where time is more freely available for discussion. Once again this is another indication that the selection of activities is important in meeting learning outcomes.

In terms of deep ecology the concentration on aims such as interpersonal relationships, self-esteem and self-awareness (when narrowly defined) has certain consequences. As Smyth (1995: 14) observes 'the educators' priorities and expectations...may be more human-centred relating to personal and social development of their students'. Consequently, for centres to move from anthropocentric approaches to something more ecocentric the programmes would need to be more focussed, with less serendipity, include more pupil-centredness and less instructor-centredness, embrace theory as well as practice and connect the pupil's inner reality with their outer. Support for such a view comes from an Australian outdoor educator who has stated 'outdoor education should be promoting moves, albeit tentative moves, towards a different worldview, towards enabling students to critically analyse the way they live and ultimately develop more environmentally sympathetic practices' (Martin, 1993: 12). He is 'increasingly convinced that developing an alternative view of the world in this manner is the most defensible and desirable rationale for outdoor education' (Martin, 1993:10).

Environmental Education

In contrast to Martin's argument, what emerges from these findings is that in these centres there is no strategic vision of what outdoor education can achieve in terms of personal and social development or environmental education. The findings suggest that one of the major reasons for this is the lack of a developed body of theory from which to evaluate and moderate practice. Consequently, the environmental activities, interpretive techniques and Countryside Code which currently pass for environmental education merely tinker around the edges of deep ecology. There is no attempt to build upon these experiences in the focussed and pedagogically diverse manner suggested by Reason's (1998) epistemological framework. In other words the activities and ideas which underpin them are anthropocentric. Any attempt to move beyond anthropocentrism depends on the instructors' personal interests.

The only exception to this is the IEE environmental education package *Earthkeepers*. From a deep ecology perspective these are important courses as they introduce young people to ecological processes through experiential, affective and cognitive means, encouraging them to think of their own values and actions. It is the most theoretically explicit area of work undertaken by centres (including personal and social development) and is the only example of an environmental education programme where the outcomes are elaborated in advance of activities. There may be some doubt about the internal validity of the package but for the time being it represents the only focused and integrated attempt at ecocentric environmental education found at the centres. However, it must be remembered that not all centres provide these courses and of the two who do the maximum number offered annually is normally three.

The conclusion to be drawn from these findings is that the potential for centres to deliver outcomes based on sustainable living is not being realised. I have referred to policy documents to show the international and national link between sustainability and education; how the Scottish Executive has called on all sectors of society to deliver on sustainable living; and how organisations external to outdoor education (WWF and SEEC) identify a specific role for outdoor education. Despite this being a very specific point relating to environmental education there is a more general point to be made. As things stand, centres remain peripheral to educational developments. Initiatives develop and centres respond in a reactive way. There is no engagement during national policy initiation when proponents of outdoor education might argue their case. Whilst this situation remains, outdoor education centres will always remain isolated from educational developments and be unrepresented in discussion on education policy and curricular diversity.

Despite this lack of strategic support outdoor education represents a special

pedagogical opportunity because of its:

- potential for epistemological diversity
- potential for subject integration and holistic (systemic) thinking
- potential for integrating affective, cognitive and physical domains of learning
- potential for education related to values and action
- direct engagement with the countryside
- independence from curricular pressures at schools
- potential to support the curriculum
- potential for pupil-centredness
- ratios, which allow special relationships between instructor/pupil and visiting teacher/pupil
- potential to use the residential centre as an educational resource (architecture as pedagogy)
- potential arising out of the residential experience where pupils have the opportunity to consider their own lives from a different perspective.

In light of this list and analysis above, it is clear that outdoor education has a mandate to provide education for sustainable living but does not use it. There are reasons for this.

Outdoor education as it is currently practised is not seen as transformational. Practitioners would argue that it is transformational through its work related to interpersonal relationships, self-esteem and self-awareness. However, I have presented evidence to show that this is less to do with the transformation of individuals and more to do with delivering programmes based on institutionalised practices and inherited ideologies. It is more to do with teaching objectives than learning outcomes. Transformative learning needs a vision and a methodological framework as a means of direction. This is what outdoor education does not have.

For centres to adopt a vision of sustainable living the first step would require thinking about the environment not simply as the 'green' environment but to develop programmes which include political and socio-economic aspects. However, if centres were to move from their current position of institutionalised practice to embracing transformational learning then it is clear that centres would be involved in transformation themselves. Consequently, principals acknowledge they would be involved in managing a process of organisational change.

The barriers to change are the lack of knowledge about sustainable development which would need to be overcome by some form of external staff training. However, this

form of staff training in itself would be contentious to some instructors as it would not conform to what has traditionally been considered as legitimate (NGB awards). In addition those instructors would not see the relevance of sustainable development to their present work.

In order to deal with the organisational tension between what is presently valued and the extent to which organisational cultures will tolerate or welcome change, centres could adopt a whole-centre approach. This would involve not only technical elements such as recycling, energy efficiency and the use and disposal of materials, but include staff ethos in addition to philosophical and pedagogical aspects. One of the challenges would be to create curricula to support sustainability goals and this would mean redefining and perhaps letting go of some of 'what has always been done'. This process would include all of the departments within the centre as well as those external to it.

In this respect schools would need to be consulted since principals believe, as customers, they are committed to the type of programme currently on offer. This consultation would involve local authority education officers who, like schools, believe the most important aspect of outdoor education at their respective centres to be outcomes relating to personal and social development. Furthermore, they are all of the opinion, from their dealings with elected members, that the future of centres is secure. Here is a very powerful affirmation from the major agencies involved in outdoor education that existing centre provision is satisfactory.

However, no current research exists to support or deny these claims and there is little evidence of proactive and sustained attempts by centres to demonstrate the potential diversity of programmes. Outdoor education is not a policy initiative of any of the local authority departments whilst two of the five officers acknowledged having no understanding of the relationship between education and sustainable development.

Local authority officers state that there will be no initiatives relating to outdoor education coming from the departments since they believe it is up to centres to decide their own agenda. A stalemate exists therefore where centres will not act without local authority approval whilst local authorities are not going to advise centres. Instead of seeing themselves as being hamstrung, without guidance from the local authority, centres could view this situation as one of autonomy. Centres have the opportunity and freedom to develop programmes for sustainable living if they choose to. At the same time schools have a greater degree of autonomy with the advent of DMR. An example of where this freedom can lead is found in the case of Lochnagar where a tripartite management group (local authority officer, centre principal and school representative)

to promote outdoor education has been established. Whilst the other local authority officers suggest that centres could be more proactive but do nothing themselves, this authority has begun looking for a vision.

To assist in realising the goal of outdoor education 'for' sustainable living, consideration must be given to appropriate pre-service training of instructors and what is deemed to be appropriate. Provision would also need to be made for in-service training so that instructors are made aware of changes to the educational curriculum (such as the recent *5-14 Environmental Studies* revision) and government policy initiatives to which they can contribute. However, responsibility does not lie solely with centres.

From a research perspective data are required to understand and evaluate phenomenological aspects of pupils' experiences whilst at outdoor centres. This point is recognised by all local authority officers who acknowledge there are difficulties with the measurement and evaluation of outdoor education. Consequently, a better understanding is required of the types of activity and modes of engagement conducive to outcomes related to outdoor education generally and sustainable living specifically. There is a joint role for researchers and practitioners to experiment with programmes to identify the relationship between teaching objectives and learning outcomes. For example, current programmes could be evaluated and then act as a control whilst a modified programme, such as the one I presented, could be used to experiment with other outcomes. This experimentation would need the help of instructors not simply for experimental purposes but also to counter the anticipated sense of disempowerment that principals predict in managing this process. Ways of measurement and evaluation need to be built into the research so that the effectiveness of programmes can be monitored after the experimental phase. At the same time theoretical perspectives need to be developed to support practice, to provide a basis for the interpretation of empirical data and to act as a template from which hypotheses can be tested. There needs to be a better flow of information between the practitioner and research elements of outdoor education; a reflexive endeavour which moderates ideas and practice.

Only when all this takes place will the potential of outdoor education as an innovative educational experience, rooted in a deep ecology ontology and practised through epistemological diversity, begin to be realised.

REFERENCES

- Abram, D. (1997) *The Spell of the Sensuous*. New York: Vintage.
- Adair, J. (1987) *Effective Teambuilding* (second edition). London: Pan.
- Adams, F. (1999) 5-14: Origins, Development and Implementation. In: T. G. K. Bryce and W. M. Humes (eds) *Scottish Education*, pp. 349-359. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Adventure and Environmental Awareness Conference Report* 11-18 March, (1984) Cumbria: Adventure and Environmental Awareness Conference Steering Group.
- Advisory Group on Education for Sustainable Development (1999) *Scotland the Sustainable? The Learning Process: Action for the Scottish Parliament*. Edinburgh: The Scottish Office.
- Agenda 21. The United Nations Conference on Environment and Development. (1992) *Earth Summit '92*. London: The Regency Press.
- Allison, M. and Taylor, J. (1995) *Outdoor Activity Centres in Wales. Final Report*. Edinburgh: Centre for Leisure Research.
- An Teallach. (1999) EMAS at (An Teallach) *Outdoor Education Centre: Activities, Education and Grounds*.
- Association of Heads of Outdoor Education Centres, National Association of Field Studies Officers and National Association for Outdoor Education. (1988) *Outdoor Education Safety and Practice - Guidelines for Guidelines*. London: The Duke of Edinburgh Award.
- Bacon, S. (1983) *The Conscious Use of Metaphor in Outward Bound*. Colorado: Colorado Outward Bound School.
- Baczala, K. (1992) *Environmental Audit: Towards a School Policy for Environmental Education*. Wolverhampton University: National Association for Environmental Education.
- Bahm, A. J. (1974) *Metaphysics. An Introduction*. London: Barnes and Noble.
- Barnes, P. (1997) *Theory Into Practice: The Complete Practical Theory of Outdoor Education and Personal Development*. Glasgow: University of Strathclyde.
- Barr, I. (1998) Environmental Education and Sustainable Development. In: J. Smyth (ed) *Learning to Sustain*, pp. 25-26. Stirling: Scottish Environmental Education Council.
- Barrett, J. and Greenaway, R. (1995) *Why Adventure? The Role of Outdoor Adventure in Young People's Personal and Social Development*. Coventry: Foundation for Outdoor Adventure.
- Barry, J. (1999) *Rethinking Green Political Thought*. London: Sage.

- Barwise, J. (1998) *Environmental Management Systems*. Department of Environment, Transport and Regions and Forum for the Future.
- Bateson, G. (1972) *Steps to an Ecology of Mind*. New York: Ballantine.
- Bauman, Z. (1978) *Hermeneutics and Social Science*. London: Hutchinson.
- Beedie, P. (1996) Where are the Risk Takers in Outdoor Education?: A Critical Analysis of Two Current Perspectives. *Journal of Adventure Education and Outdoor Leadership*, 12 (4): 10-13.
- Beinn Dearg (undated) *Handbook and Organisers Notes*. Beinn Dearg.
- Bernstein, R. (1983) *Beyond Objectivism and Relativism: Science, Hermeneutics and Praxis*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Bloom, B. S. (ed) (1956) *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives: Book 1 Cognitive Domain*. London: Longman.
- Bloom, B. S., Krathwohl, D. R. and Masia, B. B. (eds) (1964) *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives: Book 2 Affective Domain*. London: Longman.
- Boardman, P. (1978) *The Worlds of Patrick Geddes: Biologist, Town planner. Re-educator, peace warrior*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Bowers, C. A. (1993) *Education, Cultural Myths and the Ecological Crisis*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Bowles, S. (1996) Techniques and Philosophy. Blending Roots/ Or Sowing Maybe-Seeds in Outdoor Adventure Education. *Journal of Adventure Education and Outdoor Leadership*, 13 (2): 7-18.
- Brennan, A. (1994) Environmental Literacy and Educational Ideal. *Environmental Values*, 3 (1): 3-16.
- Brookes, A (1999) Nature-Based Tourism as Education for Sustainability: Possibilities, Limitations, Contradictions. *A paper presented to the 34th World Congress of the Institute of Sociology*, Tel Aviv, July 11-15.
- Brunton, R. (1963) *From School to Further Education. A Report of a Working Party on the Linkage of Secondary and Further Education (The Brunton Report)*. Edinburgh: HMSO.
- Bryman, A. and Cramer, D. (1990) *Quantitative Data Analysis For Social Scientists*. London: Routledge.
- Byrne, B. M. (1996) *Measuring Self-Concepts Across The Life Span*. Washington DC: American Psychological Association.
- Cairngorms Partnership (2000) *Learning for a Sustainable Future: an Education for Sustainable Development Strategy for the Cairngorms*. Grantown-on-Spey.
- Capra, F. (1996) *The Web of Life*. London: Harper Collins.

- Carr, D. (1999) Values Education in Scotland. In: T. G. K. Bryce and W. M. Humes (eds) *Scottish Education*, pp. 296-303. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Carson, R. (1965) *Silent Spring*. London: Penguin.
- Cason, D. and Gillis, H. L. (1994) A Meta-Analysis of Outdoor Adventure Programming With Adolescents. *Journal of Experiential Education*, 17 (1): 40-47.
- Cheesmond, J. (1981) Outdoor Pursuits in Education - A Case for Inclusion. *Scottish Journal of Physical Education*, 9 (3): 20-26.
- Cheesmond, J. (1999) written communication (12/2/99).
- Cheesmond, J. and Yates, J. (1979) *Research Report of the Outdoor Education Programme in Lothian Region Secondary Schools*. Edinburgh: Dunfermline College of Physical Education.
- Clay, G. (1999) Outdoor and Adventurous Activities: An OFSTED Survey. *Horizons*, 5: 17-18.
- Clayton, M. H. and Radcliffe, J. N. (1996) *Sustainability: A Systems Approach*. London: Earthscan.
- Coalter, F. (1988) *Sport and Anti-Social Behaviour. Research Report no 2*. Edinburgh: Scottish Sports Council.
- Cohen, L. and Manion, L. (1994) *Research Methods in Education*. London: Routledge.
- Cook, L. (1999) The 1944 Education Act and Outdoor Education: From Policy to Practice. *History of Education*, 28 (2): 157-172.
- Cooper, G. (1991a) The Role of Outdoor and Field Study Centres in Educating for the Environment. *Journal of Adventure Education*, 8 (2): 10-11.
- Cooper, G. (1991b) The Greening of Outdoor Centres. *Journal of Adventure Education*, 8 (2): 12.
- Cooper, G. (1994) The Role of Outdoor Education in Education for the 21st Century. *Journal of Adventure Education and Outdoor Leadership*, 11 (2): 9-12.
- Cooper, G. (1997) How Outdoor Education Contributes to Sustainability. *Horizons*, 1: 23-27.
- Cooper, G. (1998) *Outdoors With Young People: A Leaders Guide to Outdoor Activities, the Environment and Sustainability*. Lyme Regis: Russell House.
- Cornell, J. B. (1979) *Sharing Nature With Children*. Watford: Exley.
- Council for Environmental Education. (1996) *Our World - Our Responsibility*. Reading.
- Creswell, J. W. (1994) *Research Design. Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*. London: Sage.

Crowther, N. (1988) The Role for Outdoor Education Teachers in Providing for the Needs of Tomorrow's Society - a Philosophy and a Justification. *Journal of Adventure Education and Outdoor Leadership*, 1 (6): 12-15.

Crowther, N. (1999) written communication (24/2/99).

Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1975) *Beyond Boredom and Anxiety*. London: Josey-Bass.

Dargie, T. C. D. and Briggs, D. J. (1991) *State of the Scottish Environment*. Perth: Scottish Wildlife and Countryside Link.

Dearling, A. and Armstrong, H. (1994) *The New Youth Games Book*. Lyme Regis: Russell House.

DeLay, R. (1996) Forming Knowledge: Constructivist Learning and Experiential Education. *Journal of Experiential Education*, 19 (2): 76-81.

Department of Education and Science. (1975) *Outdoor Education - Dartington Conference Report 23-30 October*. Department of Education and Science.

Department of Education and Science (1983) *Learning Out of Doors: An HMI Survey of Outdoor Education and Short Stay Residential Experience*. Department of Education and Science.

Dewey, J. (1963) *Experience and Education*. London: Collier-Macmillan.

Donaldson, M. (1978) *Children's Minds*. London: Fontana Press.

Drasdo, H. (1973) *Education and the Mountain Centres*. Llanrwst: Tyddyn Gabriel.

Drengson, A. R. (1980) Wilderness Travel as an Art and as a Paradigm for Outdoor Education. *Quest*, 32 (1): 110-120.

Education (Scotland) Act 1945.

Education (Scotland) Act 1969.

Entwistle, N. (1997) Contrasting Perspectives on Learning. In: F. Marton, D. Hounsell and N. Entwistle (eds), *The Experience of Learning* (second edition), pp. 3-22. Edinburgh: Scottish Academic Press.

Environmental Education Research (1999) 5 (4).

Ernst, M. S. and Donald, A. H. (1993) Operation Dolygaer. *Journal of Adventure Education and Outdoor Leadership*, 10 (4): 13-15.

Evernden, N. (1985) *The Natural Alien* (second edition). London: University of Toronto Press.

Faulkner, L. (1983) *Outdoor Education Centres in Scotland: A Report on the Situation in 1982 and on Developments Since 1970*. Perth: Countryside Commission for Scotland.

Feyerabend, P. (1993) *Against Method* (third edition). London: Verso.

- Fien, J. (ed) (1993) *Environmental Education: A Pathway to Sustainability*. Victoria: Deakin University.
- Fletcher, B. (1971) *The Challenge of Outward Bound*. London: Heineman.
- Fowler, D. (2000) written communication (25/1/00).
- Freire, P. (1972) *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. London: Penguin.
- Fullan, M. (1991) *The New Meaning of Educational Change*. London: Cassell.
- Gair, N. P. (1997) *Outdoor Education: Theory and Practice*. London: Cassell.
- Gardner, H. (1993) *Frames of Mind: The Theory of Multiple Intelligences* (second edition). London: Fontana.
- Gass, M. (1990) Transfer Learning in Adventure Education. In: J. C. Miles and S. Priest (eds) *Adventure Education*, pp. 199-208. Venture Publishing: State College, PA.
- General Teaching Council for Scotland. (1990) *The Case for Outdoor Education in the Curriculum*. Edinburgh.
- Golden-Biddle, K. and Locke, K. D. (1997) *Composing Qualitative Research*. London: Sage.
- Grayling, A. (1988) *Wittgenstein*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Greenaway, R. (1990) *More Than Activities*. Edinburgh: Save the Children Fund.
- Greenaway, R. (1996) *Reviewing Activities: Why and How*. Penrith: National Association for Outdoor Education Publications.
- Gore, A. (1992) *Earth in the Balance: Forging a New Common Purpose*. London: Earthscan.
- Gurevitz, R. (1997) Understanding Children's Worlds. In: J. Parry and A. Scott (eds) *Learning to be Green: The Future of Environmental Education*, p. 5. University of Sussex: ESRC Global Change Programme.
- Halls, N. (1997a) The Development of Outdoor Education in Strathclyde Region (Part I). *Scottish Journal of Physical Education*, 25 (1): 36-38.
- Halls, N. (1997b) The Development of Outdoor Education in Strathclyde Region (Part II). *Scottish Journal of Physical Education*, 25 (2): 12-28.
- Handy, C. (1985) *Understanding Organizations* (third edition). London: Penguin.
- Harding, S. (1997) What is Deep Ecology? *Resurgence*, 185: 14-17.
- Hargreaves, J. (1986) *Sport, Power and Culture*. Oxford: Polity Press.
- Harrison, C. (1991) *Countryside Recreation in a Changing Society*. London: TMS Partnership.

Hart, P., Jickling, B. and Kool, R. (1999) Starting Points: Questions of Quality in Environmental Education. In: B. Jickling (ed) *Canadian Journal of Environmental Education*, 4: 104-124.

Harvey, D. (1990) *The Condition of Postmodernity*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Harvey, T. (1995) An Education 21 Programme: Orienting Environmental Education Towards Sustainable Development and Capacity Building for Rio. *Environmentalist*, 15: 202-210.

Hattie, J., Marsh, H. W., Neill, J. and Edwards, G. E. (1997) Adventure Education and Outward Bound: Out-of-Class Experiences That Make A Lasting Difference. *Review of Educational Research*, 67 (1): 43-87.

Hepburn, R. W. (ed) (1968) Moral Philosophy. In: R. J. Hirst (ed) *Philosophy*, pp. 93-131. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Heron, J. (1996) *Co-operative Inquiry: Research Into the Human Condition*. London: Sage.

Higgins, P. and Loynes, C. (1997) On the Nature of Outdoor Education. In: P. Higgins, C. Loynes and N. Crowther (eds). *A Guide for Outdoor Educators in Scotland*, pp. 6-8. SNH: Perth.

Higgins, P., Loynes, C. and Crowther, N. (eds) (1997) *A Guide for Outdoor Educators in Scotland*. SNH: Perth.

Hirst, R. J. (1968) *Philosophy*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Hitt, P. (1990) Outdoor Education Within the Scottish Curriculum. *Adventure Education*, 7 (2): 4-5.

Hogan, J. M. (1968) *Impelled Into Experiences*. London: E. P. Publishing.

Hogan, R. (1992) The Natural Environment in Wilderness Programmes Playing Field or Sacred Space? *Journal of Adventure Education and Outdoor Leadership*, 9 (1): 25-31.

Honderich, T. (ed) (1995) *The Oxford Companion to Philosophy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hopkins, D. and Putnam, R. (1993) *Personal Growth Through Adventure*. London: David Fulton Publishers.

Horwood, B. (1991) Tasting the Berries: Deep Ecology and Experiential Education. *Journal of Experiential Education*, 14 (3): 23-26.

Huckle, J. (1995) *Reaching Out: Professional Development for Teachers*. Surrey: WWF UK.

Huckle, J. and Sterling, S. (eds) (1996) *Education for Sustainability*. London: Earthscan.

- Hudson, M. (1995) *Managing Without Profit: The Art of Third-Sector Organizations*. London: Penguin.
- Hunt, J. (ed) (1989) *In Search of Adventure*. Bournemouth: Talbot Adair Press.
- Illich, I. (1996) *Deschooling Society*. London: Marion Boyars.
- International Union for the Conservation of Nature, United Nations Environment Programme and World Wildlife Fund. (1980) *World Conservation Strategy*. Switzerland: IUCN.
- International Union for the Conservation of Nature, United Nations Environment Programme and the World Wide Fund For Nature. (1991) *Caring for the Earth: A Strategy for Sustainable Living*. Switzerland: IUCN.
- Jary, J. and Jary, J. (1991) *Dictionary of Sociology*. London: Harper Collins.
- Jickling, B. and Spork, H. (1998) Education for the Environment: a critique. *Environmental Education Research*, 4 (3): 309-327.
- Johnson, G., and Scholes, K. (1989) *Exploring Corporate Strategy*. London: Prentice Hall.
- Kant, I. (1933) *Critique of Pure Reason* (translated by Norman Kemp Smith). London: Macmillan.
- Kant, I. (1993) *Critique of Pure Reason*. London: Orion.
- Kaplan, S. and Talbot, J. F. (1983) Psychological Benefits of a Wilderness Experience. In: I. Altman and J. F. Wohlwill (eds) *Behaviour and the Environment*, pp. 163-203.
- Keighley, P. (1985) Using the Potential of Outdoor Education as a Vehicle for Integrated Learning. *Journal of Adventure Education*, 2 (4/5): 26-30.
- Keighley, P. (1998) *Learning Through First Hand Experience Out of Doors. The Contribution Which Outdoor Education can Make to Children's Learning as part of the National Curriculum*. Penrith: National Association for Outdoor Education.
- Kuhn, T. S. (1962) *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. London: University of Chicago Press.
- Leopold, A. (1989) *A Sand County Almanac* (special commemorative edition). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Loader, C. (1952) *Cairngorm Adventure at Glenmore Lodge*. Edinburgh: William Brown.
- Lopez, B. (1986) *Arctic Dreams*. London: Picador.
- Lovelock, J. (1995) *Gaia. A New Look at Life on Earth*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Loynes, C. (1984) Adventure Education. In: *Adventure and Environmental Awareness Conference Report*, 11-18 March pp. 17-19. Cumbria: Adventure and Environmental

Awareness Conference Steering Group.

Luckner, J. and Nadler, R. (1992) *Processing the Experience to Generalise Learning* (second edition). Dubuque: Kendall Hunt.

MacKenzie, R. F. (1970) *State School*. Middlesex: Penguin Education Special.

MacKenzie, R. F. (1989) *A Search For Scotland*. London: Collins.

Mansfield, R. perscoms between August 1998 and December 1999.

Marshall, P. (1995) *Natures Web: Rethinking Our Place on Earth*. London: Cassell.

Martin, P. (1993) Outdoor Education: Practical Implications of a Deep Ecology. *The Outdoor Educator: Journal of the Victorian Outdoor Education Association Incorporated*, Sept. pp. 10-16.

Maslow, A. (1954) *Motivation and Personality* (second edition). New York: Harper Row.

Mason, J. (1996) *Qualitative Researching*. London: Sage.

May, T. (1997) *Social Research: Issues, Methods and Process* (second edition). Buckingham: Open University Press.

Maykut, P. and Morehouse, R. (1994) *Beginning Qualitative Research*. London: Falmer Press.

McDonald, P. (1997) *Climbing Lessons: Inside Outdoor Education*. Published by Pete McDonald, P O Box 323, Kaikohe, Northland, New Zealand.

Miles, J. and Priest, S. (1990) *Adventure Education*. Pennsylvania: Venture Publishing.

Miles, M. and Huberman, A. (1994) *Qualitative Data Analysis. An Expanded Sourcebook*. London: Sage.

Moodie, A.M. and Kwong, J. (1997) *Environmental Education*. London: Institute of Economic Affairs.

Mortlock, C. (1973) *Adventure Education and Outdoor Pursuits*. Ambleside: Middleton and Son.

Mortlock, C. (1978) *Adventure Education*. Ambleside: Old Fisherbeck.

Mortlock, C. (1984) *The Adventure Alternative*. Cumbria: Cicerone Press.

Muir, J. (1992) *The Eight Wilderness-Discovery Books*. London: Diadem Books.

Naess, A. (1988) Self Realization: An Ecological Approach to Being in the World. In: J. Seed, J. Macy, P. Fleming, and A. Naess. *Thinking Like a Mountain*, pp 19-30. Philadelphia: New Society Publishers.

Naess, A. (1989) *Ecology, Community and Lifestyle*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- National Association for Outdoor Education. (1970) Steering Group Statement.
- Neal, P. and Palmer, J. (1990) *Environmental Education in the Primary School*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Neill, J. and Richards, G. (1998) Does Outdoor Education Really Work? A Summary of Recent Meta-Analyses. *Australian Journal of Outdoor Education*, 3 (1): 2-9.
- Newsom, J. (1963) *Half Our Future: A Report of the Central Advisory Council for Education (England)*. London: HMSO.
- Nicol, R. (1999) A Survey of Scottish Outdoor Centres. *Horizons*, 6: 14-16.
- Nicol, R. and Higgins, P. (1998) A Sense of Place: A Context for Environmental Outdoor Education. In: P. Higgins and B. Humberstone (eds) *Celebrating Diversity: Learning By Sharing Cultural Differences*, pp. 50-55. Buckingham Chilterns University College: European Institute for Outdoor Adventure Education and Experiential Learning.
- Nicol, R., Higgins, P. and Crowther, N. (1999) Outdoor Education for Sustainability: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives. In: M. Allison, J. Horne and L. Jackson (eds) *Scottish Centre Research Papers in Sport, Leisure and Society*, 3: 126-132. Edinburgh: University of Edinburgh.
- Nichols, G. (1994) Major Issues in the Evaluation of the Impact of Outdoor Based Experiences. *Journal of Adventure Education and Outdoor Leadership*, 11 (1): 11-14.
- Noble, P. (1995) Ramblings of a Disillusioned Outdoor Pursuitist. *Journal of Adventure Education and Outdoor Leadership*, 12 (1): 20-21.
- Norwood, C. (1943) *Report of the Secondary Schools Examination Council*. London: HMSO.
- O'Connor, D. J. and Carr, B. (1982) *Introduction to the Theory of Knowledge*. Brighton: Harvester Press.
- Ogilvie, K. (1993) *Leading and Managing Groups in the Outdoors*. Sheffield: National Association for Outdoor Education.
- O'Riordan, T. (1981) *Environmentalism*. London: Pion.
- Orr, D. (1992) *Ecological Literacy: Education and the Transition to a Postmodern World*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Orr, D. (1993) Schools for the Twenty-First Century. *Resurgence*, 160: 16-17.
- Orr, D. (1994a) The Marriage of Mind and Nature. *Resurgence*, 166: 6-7.
- Orr, D. (1994b) *Earth in Mind*. Washington DC: Island Press.
- O'Sullivan, E. (1999) *Transformative Learning: Educational Vision for the 21st Century*. London: Zed Books.
- Oxford Dictionary of Current English* (1984). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Palmer, J. (1998) *Environmental Education in the 21st Century: Theory, Practice*,

Progress and Promise. London: Routledge.

Parker, T. (ed) (1970) *An Approach to Outdoor Activities*. London: Pelham Books.

Parker, T. and Meldrum, K. (1973) *Outdoor Education*. London: J. M. Dent and Sons Ltd.

Parry, J. and Scott, A. (eds) (1997) *Learning to be Green: The Future of Environmental Education*. University of Sussex: ESRC Global Environmental Change Programme.

Pepper, D. (1986) *The Roots of Modern Environmentalism*. London: Routledge.

Pepper, D. (1996) *Modern Environmentalism. An Introduction*. London: Routledge.

Peräkylä, A. (1997) Reliability and Validity in Research Based on Tapes and Transcripts. In: D. Silverman (ed) *Qualitative Research: Theory, Method and Practice*, pp. 201-220. London: Sage.

Pirsig, R. (1974) *Zen and the Art of Motor cycle Maintenance*. London: Bodley Head.

Porritt, J. (1984) *Seeing Green*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Posch, P. (1993) Approaches to Values in Environmental Education. In: *Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development: Environment and School Initiatives (ENSI) Project, Values in Education Conference Report 5-7 May*, pp. 27-35. Dundee: SCCC.

Priest, S. and Gass, M. (1997) *Effective Leadership in Adventure Programming*. University of New Hampshire: Human Kinetics.

Reason, P. (1998) A Participatory World. *Resurgence*, 186: 42-44.

Reid, D. (1995) *Sustainable Development. An Introductory Guide*. London: Earthscan.

Roberts, K., White, G. E. and Parker, H. J. (1974) *The Character-Training Industry: Adventure-Training Schemes in Britain*. Newton Abbot: David and Charles.

Rodger, A. (1993) Values and Relationships Towards the Environment. In: *Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development: Environment and School Initiatives (ENSI) Project, Values in Education Conference Report 5-7 May*, pp. 10-17. Dundee: SCCC.

Rogers, C. (1983) *Freedom to Learn*. London: Merrill Publishing Company.

Rose, S. (1997) *Lifelines: Biology, Freedom, Determinism*. Middlesex: Penguin.

Rosenberg, M. (1989) *Society and the Adolescent Self-Image* (reprint edition). Middletown CT: Wesleyan University Press.

Roszak, T., Gomes, M. E. and Kanner, A. D. (eds) (1995) *Ecopsychology*. San Francisco: Sierra Club Books.

Rothenberg, D. (1989) Introduction. In: A. Naess, *Ecology, Community and Lifestyle*, pp. 1-22. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Royal Geographic Society Conference (20 May 1998) *Environmental Education, Ethics and Citizenship*.

Royal Society for the Protection of Birds. (1999): www.rspb.org.uk/education

Royce, D. (1986) "Adventure Mis-Education" (or Misunderstanding the Adventure Experience!). *Journal of Adventure Education and Outdoor Leadership*, 3 (1): 16-18.

Royce, D. (1987) Outdoor Education - Aims and Approaches an Inherent Dilemma. *Journal of Adventure Education and Outdoor Leadership*, 4 (1): 12-14.

Rubens, D. (1997) *Outdoor Education, Adventure and Learning - A Fusion*. University of Edinburgh: Unpublished MSc (Education) Degree.

Russell, B. (1977) *Education and the Social Order*. London: Unwin.

Russell, B. (1979) *A History of Western Philosophy*. London: Unwin.

Schumacher, E. F. (1974) *Small is Beautiful*. London: Abacus Books.

Scott, D. and Usher, R. (eds) (1996) *Understanding Educational Research*. London: Routledge.

Scottish CCC (1999) *Our World, Our Future*. Dundee: SCCC.

Scottish Education Department. (1965) *Primary Education in Scotland*. Edinburgh: HMSO.

Scottish Education Department (1971) *Circular Number 804 (1)*. Edinburgh: HMSO.

Scottish Environmental Education Council. (1996) *Outdoor Education: Issues and Priorities*. Stirling: SEEC.

Scottish Environmental Education Council. (1998) *Learning to Sustain*. University of Stirling.

Scottish Natural Heritage. (1993) *Sustainable Development and the Natural Heritage*. Perth: SNH.

Scottish Office. (1999) *Down to Earth: A Scottish Perspective on Sustainable Development*.

Scottish Office Education Department (1993) *Learning for Life: a national strategy for environmental education in Scotland*. Edinburgh: HMSO.

Scottish Office Education Department. (1993a) *Curriculum and Assessment in Scotland. National Guidelines. Environmental Studies 5 - 14*. SOED.

Scottish Office Education Department. (1993b) *Curriculum and Assessment in Scotland. National Guidelines. Expressive Arts 5 - 14*. SOED.

- Scottish Office Education Department. (1993c) *Curriculum and Assessment in Scotland. National Guidelines. Personal and Social Development 5 - 14*. SOED.
- Secretary of State for Scotland's Advisory Group on Education for Sustainable Development (1999) *Scotland the Sustainable*. Edinburgh: Scottish Office.
- Seed, J., Macy, J., Fleming, P. and Naess, A. (eds) (1988) *Thinking Like a Mountain. Towards a Council of All Beings*. Philadelphia: New Society Publishers.
- Sessions, G. (ed) (1995) *Deep Ecology for the 21st Century*. London: Shambhala.
- Shallcross, T. (1996) Caring for the Environment: Can we be Effective Without the Affective. *International Journal of Environmental Education and Information*, 15 (2): 121-134.
- Sheehy, N., Wylie, J., McGuinness, C. and Orchard, G. (2000) How Children Solve Environmental Problems: Using Computer Simulations to Investigate Systems Thinking. *Environmental Education Research*, 6 (2): 109-126.
- Silverman, D. (ed) (1997) *Qualitative Research: Theory, Method and Practice*. London: Sage.
- Silverman, D. (2000) *Doing Qualitative Research: A Practical Handbook*. London: Sage.
- Simpson, P. (1992) *Outdoor Education: Perceptions of Teacher Practitioners*. University of Stirling: Unpublished Master of Education dissertation.
- Smyth, J. (1995) Environment and Education: a View of a Changing Scene. *Environmental Education Research*, 1 (1): 3-19.
- Smyth, J. (1998) (ed) *Learning to Sustain*. Stirling: Scottish Environmental Education Council.
- Smyth, J. (1999) Is There a Future for Education Consistent with Agenda 21? In: B. Jickling (ed). *Canadian Journal of Environmental Education*, 4: 69-82.
- Smyth, J., Blackmore, C. and Harvey, T. (eds) (1997) Education for Sustainability at the United Nations: Making Progress? *Environmentalist*, (17): 173-179.
- Snowsport Scotland Handbook*. (2000) Edinburgh: Snowsport Scotland.
- Sterling, S. (1996) Education in Change. In: J. Huckle and S. Sterling (eds) *Education for Sustainability*, pp. 18-39. London: Earthscan.
- Stimpson, D (1976) *Non-Teaching Staff in Secondary Schools: Youth and Community Workers, Librarians and Instructors*. A Report of a Working Party Appointed by the Secretary of State for Scotland. Edinburgh: HMSO.
- Strauss, A. and Corbin, J. (1990) *Basics of Qualitative Research. Grounded Theory Procedures and Techniques*. London: Sage.
- Sustainable Development Education Panel (1998) *First Annual Report*. London: Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions.

Sustainability Education in European Primary Schools. (1997) The European Commission, Scottish Natural Heritage and Moray House Institute of Education.

Suzuki, D. (1997) *The Sacred Balance*. NSW, Australia: Allen and Unwin.

Taylor, S. J. and Bogdan, R. (1998) *Introduction to Qualitative Research Methods: A Guidebook and Resource* (third edition). Chichester: Wiley.

Taverner, S. (1994) *Local Education Authority Outdoor Centres as a Resource for Sport and Active Recreation*. A report to the Sports Council.

Teichman, J. and Evans, K. C. (1995) *Philosophy: A Beginners Guide* (second edition). Oxford: Blackwell.

Thoreau, H. (1983) *Walden and Civil Disobedience*. London: Penguin.

Tiffany, G. A. (1995a) Informal Outdoor Education (part one). *Journal of Adventure Education and Outdoor Leadership*, 12 (2): 11-14.

Tiffany, G. A. (1995b) Informal Outdoor Education (part two). *Journal of Adventure Education and Outdoor Leadership*, 12 (3): 7-9.

Tiffany, G. A. (1996) Informal Outdoor Education (part three). *Journal of Adventure Education and Outdoor Leadership*, 12 (4): 26-27.

Tomashaw, M. (1989) The Virtues of Controversy. *Bulletin of Science, Technology and Society*, 9: 66-70. USA: STS Press.

UNESCO. (1978) *Intergovernmental Conference on Environmental Education: Final Report*. Tbilisi (USSR), 14-26 October 1977. Paris: UNESCO.

United Nations Conference on Environment and Development. (1992) *Earth Summit '92*. London: The Regency Press.

Van der Ryn, S. and Cowan, S. (1996) *Ecological Design*. Washington DC: Island Press.

Van Matre, S. (1990) *Earth Education: A New Beginning*. Greenville: Institute for Earth Education.

Van Matre, S. and Johnson, B. (1987) *Earthkeepers*. Illinois: Institute of Earth Education.

Wackernagel, W. and Rees, W. (1996) *Our Ecological Footprint: Reducing Human Impact on the Earth*. Canada: New Society Publishers.

Walton, J., Alabaster, S., Richardson, S. and Harrison, R. (eds) (1997) Environmental Reporting for Global Higher Education Institutions Using the World Wide Web. *The Environmentalist*, 17: 197-208.

Warnock, G. J. (1967) *Contemporary Moral Philosophy*. London: MacMillan.

White, J. P. (1982) *The Aims of Education Restated*. London: Kegan Paul.

White, J. (1989) The Aims of Personal and Social Education. In: P. White (ed) *Personal and Social Education: Philosophical Perspectives*, pp. 7-18. London: Kogan Page.

Whitehead, A. N. (1950) *The Aims of Education and Other Essays* (second edition). London: Benn.

Williams, A. P. (1994) Outdoor Education and Physical Education in the National Curriculum. *Journal of Adventure Education and Outdoor Leadership*, 11 (4): 12-14.

Wilson, E. O. (1984) *Biophilia*. Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Wootton, M., Donaldson, N. and Clark, T. (1995) The Findings so Far. In: *Outdoor Education and our Natural Heritage*, pp. 12-20. Battleby: Scottish Natural Heritage.

Wurdinger, S. (1995) A Critical Interpretation of Commonly Held Assumptions in Adventure Education. *Journal of Adventure Education and Outdoor Leadership*, 12 (2): 6-10.

Wurdinger, S. (1997) *Philosophical Issues in Adventure Education* (third edition). Iowa: Kendall Hunt.

WWF UK (World Wide Fund For Nature). (1995) *Reaching Out Introduction*. Godalming: WWF.

Wylie, J., Sheehy, N., McGuinness, C. and Orchard, G. (eds) (1998) Children's Thinking About Air Pollution: A Systems Theory Analysis. *Environmental Education Research*, 6 (2): 109-126.

Yates, J. (1981) Outdoor Pursuits in Education - An Enigma. *Scottish Journal of Physical Education*, 9 (3): 27-33.

APPENDIX ONE

Propositions

Proposition One
In Terms Of Interpersonal Relationships Instructors Define Aims In A Conceptual Sense.

Data Items	Score
Building relationships	0
Trust building	0
Teamwork	0
Bonding	0

Proposition Two
Outdoor Educators Use Certain Indicators To Identify And Observe Interpersonal Relationships Within The Context Of Group Processes

Data Items	Score
Chatting as if we were friends	2
Looking after each other	1
Getting on with each other	1
Helping each other over obstacles	1
Listening to each other	1
Communicating with each other	1
Gaining new experiences without squabbling	1
Staying together whilst participating in an activity	1
Being kind and polite with each other	1
Co-operating with each other	1
Empathy for the whole group	1
Taking responsibility for each other	1
Supporting each other	1
Pupil involvement in decision making	1

Proposition Three
Outdoor Educators Provide Contexts And Experiences To Raise Self-Esteem

Data Items	Score
Develop confidence	1
Try things	3
Personal achievement	1
Overcoming fear of the unknown	2
Development of belief in self	1
Learn practical things	1
Being able to cope	1
Encouraged not to be afraid of failure	1

Proposition Four
Outdoor Educators Provide Contexts And Experiences To Promote Self-Awareness

Data Items	Score
Broaden experience of life's opportunities	3
The opportunity for self expression	2
To recognise strengths and weaknesses as individuals	1
Being on their own without the family influence	1
Ability to evaluate performance of self	1
Understanding of other peoples' requirements	2
Encourage the belief that you can make a difference to others	2
Encourage tolerance of others	1
Confidence in fellow pupils	1
Trust in fellow pupils	1

APPENDIX TWO

Interview and Observations - Instructors

Semi-structured interviews will be conducted with two instructors at each centre. Instructors will be selected on the basis of one being the longest serving member of staff and the other the shortest serving. These interviews will take place during and following an activity session in which I have been involved. During the activity I will be observing the extent to which attempts are made by the instructor to relate the activity within the context of specified aims. A second purpose will be to identify the extent to which this process is the product of planning. A third purpose is to identify the range of teaching styles employed by the instructor (whether differentiated, varied, flexible). The fourth purpose will be to discover the modes of engagement (physical, cognitive and affective) employed by the instructor.

Research Questions

1. Are activities used for their own sake or to achieve some other goal?
 - what are the aims of each session?
 - have they been planned in advance?
 - are they clearly stated and understood by the instructor?
 - are they evaluated to see if they are achieved?
2. What do outdoor education instructors mean when they talk about outdoor education?
3. Are some activities better than others for achieving chosen outcomes?
4. Are the aims of an outdoor education programme clearly stated? If yes who does the stating?

Brief

Fieldwork for PhD thesis. Given the recent closures and the changing nature of outdoor education provision my intention is to discover what local authorities are losing by closing centres down.

Anonymity - your answers will not be able to be identified as yours.

Asking questions during the activity and recording information by taking notes discreetly you may see but I try not to let the pupils see.

I will not interfere with what you are doing but if you feel I'm in the way tell me.

A one hour interview after the session to be recorded on a tape recorder.

General comments

- * Check the library for contents, access, and publication dates.
- * Dining room seating arrangements.
- * Need to find out if they review each day.

- * Take waterproof note book to record, tell instructor that I may take notes.
- * If I end up going out with instructors who are doing different activities then I will need to remember that what they achieve in one may well be different from another.
- * I will probably have to return to the same instructors to interview them about the environmental side.
- * Make sure that when I ask instructors if they are finished with the group (so as I can interview them) that they will not be meeting up with them later that night otherwise I could miss the debrief.
- * Is there a connection between the evening programme and the day one? Are log books used - do they reflect the days activity, are they checked for quality by their day time or main instructor?

Bearing in mind that some activities are better than others for achieving different aims (Cooper) then if the activities selected to achieve these aims are not consistent then people are not thinking about what they are doing. This would also apply if the centre had stated an aim for the school i.e. if the centre does the stating is it the same aim each week or different?

Questions to instructors (activity)

- * What is the aim of today?

Questions to instructors (interview)

Personal

- * How long have you worked as an instructor here?
- * Do you have a teaching certificate / degree?

Aims

- * Who chooses the venue?
- why this venue?
- * Has the school stated any aims (find out from all, instructor, principal, and visiting teacher)
- * Has the centre stated any aims?
- * Have you stated an aim for today (or session if it is half day)?
- * What aims have you set **prior to** this group arriving? Are these aims implicit or explicit?
- * Are the aims different from programme to programme, week to week. What other aims do you cater for?
- * Did you have any aims for yesterday?
- * Is there anything not done at the centre you would like to see introduced?

- * Is there anything done that you would like to see done away with?

Evaluation

- * How do you know if you have achieved yesterdays and today's aim?
- * Did you learn anything from yesterday that has influenced what you are doing today?
- * By the end of this week long programme what learning outcomes do you aim to achieve?
- * What can pupils learn here that they cannot learn at school, home or somewhere else?
- * When students participate in (whatever today's activity) can everybody be said to have achieved the same thing (looking for different levels)? What is different. Do you consciously cater for different levels? HOW?
- * Is there a permanence to what pupils learn here?
If YES what is it and how do you know?
- * Do you attempt to measure the impact of outdoor education programmes on pupils?
- * Is it possible to measure impact?
- * When the programme is written up is it done with activities in mind or educational processes? Is one more important than the other?

Organisation

- * Does the centre have a mission statement? What is it? If yes, how is it transferred into operational aims and then how is this monitored?
- * Other than a mission statement what else guides the practice of outdoor education here?

Environment

- * It has been suggested that 'art and drama' should feature as part of an outdoor education programme (Cooper, 1991: 12). Discuss.
- * Does the centre use specific activities for environmental education?
- or are they a consequence of being in the environment?
- * It has been suggested that 'centres should move away from...programmes based on...physical outdoor activities' (Cooper, 1991: 12). Discuss.

Outdoor education

- * Adventure is widely regarded as central to the outdoor education process. What does 'adventure' mean for you. How do you make it available to children?
- is it an adventure for you?
- * Do you have a definition for outdoor education?

- * Do you have a definition for personal and social development?
- * Do you have a definition for environmental education?
- * What are the advantages of residential outdoor education over non-residential?
- * Do you think that any of the benefits of outdoor education are unique to outdoor education (i.e. can they be achieved elsewhere -school, home, community)?
- * What is the most important aim/claim of outdoor education?
- * Are you a member of outdoor organisations? Which ones?
- looking for other than national governing bodies.
- * Do you read any publications in the outdoor press? Which ones?
- looking for other than national governing bodies.
- * Do you look to any writer or theorist of outdoor education for inspiration in your own work?
- * Where do you get your ideas to do do what you do - which source?
- * Why did you choose to become involved in outdoor education?
- * Have your attitudes regarding the value of outdoor education changed since this time?

APPENDIX THREE

Interview Schedule - Principals

These questions should be asked along with those already asked in the questionnaire

Semi -structured interviews will be conducted with the principal at each centre. I am trying to establish what it is that the principal expects their instructor to do. In addition to interviewing the centre principal I will ask for a tour of the building during which time I will be observing such aspects of the centre furnishings as posters on walls, types of books in the library, is there a laboratory? etc.

Research Questions

1. Are activities used for their own sake or to achieve some other goal?
 - what are the aims of each session?
 - have they been planned in advance?
 - are they clearly stated and understood by the instructor?
 - are they evaluated to see if they are achieved?
2. What do outdoor education instructors mean when they talk about outdoor education?
3. Are some activities better than others for achieving chosen outcomes?
4. Are the aims of an outdoor education programme clearly stated. If yes, who does the stating?
5. Something about philosophy
6. Something about the link between local authority and the centre

Brief

Fieldwork for PhD thesis. Given the recent closures and the changing nature of outdoor education provision my intention is to discover what local authorities are losing by closing centres down.

Anonymity - your answers will not be able to be identified as yours.

A one hour interview to be recorded on a tape recorder.

General Comments

- * Check the library for contents, access, and publication dates.
- * Dining room seating arrangements.
- * Is there a connection between the evening programme and the day one. Are log books used - do they reflect the days activity, are they checked for quality by their day time or main instructor?

Bearing in mind that some activities are better than others for achieving different aims (Cooper) then if the activities selected to achieve these aims are not consistent then people are not thinking about what they are doing. This would also apply if the centre had stated an aim for the school i.e. if the centre does the stating is it the same aim each week or different?

Questions to principals (interview)

Personal

- * How long have you worked as the principal here?
- * Do you have a teaching certificate / degree?

Aims

- * Are there rewards/awards for achievement? If yes, what are these awards and what are they trying to reward (hard skill, soft skill)?
- * Who makes up the weekly activity programme?
- * Who chooses the venue?
- * When a school comes here do they state any aims?
- * In the absence of school aims does the centre impose any?
- what would they be?
- * Does the same instructor have the group for the whole week? If not, how is continuity maintained from day to day?
- * Is there anything not done at the centre you would like introduce?
- * Is there anything done that you would like to do away with?
- * What does your Local Authority expect of you in terms of aims? What priorities?
If it is written can I see?
- * The *5-14 PSD* document states that education departments should advise outdoor centres on PSD. Has this happened?
- * Are the aims different from programme to programme, week to week? What other aims do you cater for?
- * Have the aims changed in the years since you have been principal? What? Why (changes to mission statement)?
- * Has there been any changes in pupil numbers passing through the centre in the last two or three years? Why is this?

Evaluation

- * What can pupils learn here that they cannot learn at school, home or somewhere else?

- * When the programme is written up is it done with activities in mind?
- or educational processes?
- * Is there a permanence to what pupils learn here?
If YES, what is it and how do you know?

Organisation

- * Does the centre have a mission statement? What is it . If yes, how is it transferred into operational aims and then how is this monitored?
- * Can I have a copy of the mission statement?
- * How do you know that individual instructors are achieving the aims set out in the mission statement?
- * Other than a mission statement what else guides the practice of outdoor education here?
 - philosophy / theory?
 - local authority guidelines?
 - yourself?
 - AALA regulations?
 - financial accountability?
- * Have the influences that affect outdoor education changed since your time here?
 - what are those influences?
 - how have they changed?
- * To what extent do instructors influence what happens at the centre?
 - what is the forum for discussion?
 - how do you resolve conflict?
- * When you employ new staff what qualities do you look for? When was the last full time staff member taken on?
- * Do you have a business plan?
 - could I see it?
- * Someone might argue that what you do here could be achieved more cheaply say in the school playground. How do you respond to that? The accountant might want to close you down.

Environment

- * It has been suggested that 'art and drama' should feature as part of an outdoor education programme (Cooper, 1991: 12). Discuss
- * It has been suggested that 'centres should move away from...programmes based on...physical outdoor activities' (Cooper, 1991: 12). Discuss.
- * Does the centre use specific activities for environmental education?
- or are they a consequence of being in the environment?

Outdoor education

- * Adventure is widely regarded as central to the outdoor education process. What

does 'adventure' mean for you? How do you make it available to children?
- is it an adventure for you?

- * Do you have a definition for outdoor education?
- * Do you have a definition for personal and social development?
- * Do you have a definition for environmental education?
- * What are the advantages of residential outdoor education over non-residential?
- * What do you see as the major benefits for a programme of outdoor education?
- * Do you think that any of the benefits of outdoor education are unique to outdoor education (i.e. can they be achieved elsewhere -school, home, community)?
- * What is the most important aim/claim of outdoor education?
- * Where do you get your ideas to do do what you do - what source?
- * What activities would be typical of the evening programme? Do they fit in with the overall ethos?
- * Do you attempt to measure the impact of outdoor education programmes on pupils?
- * Is it possible to measure impact?
- * Are you a member of outdoor organisations? Which ones?
- looking for other than national governing bodies
- * Do you read any publications in the outdoor press? Which ones?
- looking for other than national governing bodies.
- * Do you look to any writer or theorist of outdoor education for inspiration in your own work?
- * I would like to interview the person from the Local Authority with responsibility for outdoor education who would that be?
- * Figures for 1998 multi activity
- * Figures for 1998 primary v secondary

Alterations made in light of stage two pilot

- * What does your Local authority expect of you in terms of aims? what priorities? **RN** *This question added.*
- * By the end of this week long programme what learning outcomes do you aim to achieve? **RN** *This question removed because it elicited similar answers to other questions. Also the schedule was taking too long it needed trimmed.*

APPENDIX FOUR

Interview Schedule - LEA Officers

- * What is your title, what are your responsibilities?
- * Can you explain the value of outdoor education?
 - generally?
 - the particular centre?
- * What can pupils learn at outdoor centres that they cannot learn at school, home or somewhere else? The residential?
- * How does outdoor education fit in with the authorities overall educational aims?
 - where does it fit into departmental policy?
 - are these aims affected by the fact that the children pay for their residential?
- * Who provides the advisory role - linking policy to practice?
 - do you see your role as advising centres how to achieve their aims (or vice versa)?
- * Both the UK and Scottish parliament's policy rhetoric concentrates on standards, measurement and quantification in education. How does this affect outdoor education in centres?
 - does outdoor education have to be measured? How would you measure it?
 - it began amongst a culture of educational experiment (values v measurement)?
- * In terms of current Government policy initiatives can outdoor education deliver on these policy issues:
 - citizenship? How?
 - social exclusion? How?
 - sustainable development, A21 chapter 36 'education and awareness raising strand'? How?
 - 5-14 inclusion of the term SD. Has this local authority contributed to the revision of the 5-14 (SEEC and WWF say yes)?
- * SD would mean environmental audits, would money be available to do that?
 - whole centre approach?
 - £5,000 - £8,000 EMAS - then the cost of maintenance work?
- * Present budgeting systems make it difficult to plan ahead e. g. putting in double glazing into buildings saves money over a long period. Is there a solution?
- * Given the recent demise in local authority provision what future does outdoor education have? 'Best Value' raises issues of:
 - quality?
 - supply and demand, schools use of private centres?
- * Does the local authority have a formal written policy for outdoor education? Can I see it?
- * Can I get a chain of command?

Briefing to include:

This is about residential education (name the centre).